





Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2024







265.1  
M379h

# Holy Baptism

A DISSERTATION

BY THE REV. WILLIAM MASKELL M. A.

VICAR OF S. MARY CHURCH, DEVON : AND DOMESTIC

CHAPLAIN TO THE RIGHT REVEREND

THE LORD BISHOP OF

EXETER.

“ By whom was this Child baptized ?  
With what matter was this Child baptized ?  
With what words was this Child baptized ? ”

Second Edition.



London

WILLIAM PICKERING

1848

THE MASTER'S COLLEGE  
POWELL LIBRARY  
SANTA CLARITA, CA 913

~~PROPERTY OF LIBRARY~~  
~~NORTHEASTERN COLLEGIATE BIBLE INSTITUTE~~

THE JOURNAL OF THE

ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Volume 10, Part 1, 1900

London: Published by the Royal Society

1900

Price 10s.

265.1  
M379h



THE JOURNAL OF THE

ROYAL ANTHROPOLOGICAL INSTITUTE

1900

TO THE RIGHT REVEREND FATHER IN GOD  
**HENRY,**  
BY DIVINE PERMISSION LORD BISHOP  
OF EXETER,

*This Book*  
IS MOST HUMBLY AND GRATEFULLY  
INSCRIBED.



# CONTENTS.

## CHAPTER I.

	Page
MEANING of the term "Baptism;"—types, and definitions of the Christian Sacrament . . . . .	1

## CHAPTER II.

The <i>Materia remota</i> . . . . .	29
-------------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER III.

The <i>Materia proxima</i> . . . . .	55
--------------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER IV.

Benediction of the Font . . . . .	84
-----------------------------------	----

## CHAPTER V.

The Form . . . . .	98
--------------------	----

## CHAPTER VI.

Of Baptism "in the Name of Jesus" . . . . .	144
---	-----

## CHAPTER VII.

Canons enjoining the true Form ;—importance of the subject .	164
--	-----

## CHAPTER VIII.

The Minister ;—of Lay-baptism, anciently in the Church Catholic	176
---	-----



# Contents.

## CHAPTER IX.

	Page
Of Lay-baptism in the Church of England . . . . .	206

## CHAPTER X.

The Necessity of Baptism ;—of the Baptism of blood . . . .	253
--	-----

## CHAPTER XI.

Of the Institution of the Christian Sacrament ;—of “ the Baptism of John ” . . . . .	279
---	-----

## CHAPTER XII.

Hypothetical baptism ;—of iteration of baptism ;—of children baptized “ <i>invitis parentibus</i> ” . . . . .	316
--	-----

## CHAPTER XIII.

The Effects of Baptism ;—conclusion . . . . .	349
---	-----

APPENDIX . . . . .	379
--------------------	-----



# Holy Baptism.

## CHAPTER I.

**T**HE term Baptism, *Baptisma*, signifies various modes of washing, including always the idea of purification when joined with the mention of water ; and it may be taken in any of the senses in which we employ the terms, “lavatio,” “tinctio,” “ablutio,” or the like : nor is it to be denied that principally it is to be understood of that kind of “washing,” which is performed by immersion.

The anabaptists contended that the word, to baptize, *necessarily* includes dipping or immersion ; from whence it would follow, that our Saviour, commanding us to baptize, has commanded us to dip. This has been shewn by many writers to be altogether incorrect, and untrue.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> See upon this, Wall on Infant Baptism, *vol. 2. p. 328.* Vossius, *de baptismo*, *p. 24.* Schleusner, *Thesaurus*, verb. βαπτίζω.

Tournely, *de bapt. p. 4.* And, especially, Suicer, *Thes. Eccles.* verb. βαπτισμα.

In the Holy Scriptures the word is used, in at least four senses: first, literally: as where our Blessed Lord says of the Pharisees, that they eat not, “when they come from the market, except they wash.”<sup>2</sup> And, again, in the same place, He speaks of “the washing of cups, and pots.” These passages in the original are, “*εαν μη βαπτισωνται;*” and, “*βαπτισμους ποτηριων και ξεστων.*” So, in the vulgate Latin: “*nisi baptizentur,*” and “*baptismata calicum, et urceorum.*” In the apocryphal book of Judith, we are told that she “went out in the night into the valley of Bethulia, and washed herself in a fountain of water.”<sup>3</sup> The Greek reads, “*και εβαπτιζετο:*” and the Latin, “*et baptizabat se.*” Once more; in the book of Ecclesiasticus; “He that washeth himself after the touching of a dead body, if he touch it again, what availeth his washing?”<sup>4</sup> In the Greek we read, “*Βαπτιζομενος απο νεκρου:*” and in the Latin, “*Qui baptizatur à mortuo.*”

Secondly, metaphorically; nor do I see that we need separate the idea of purification from the word when so used, as it undoubtedly is to be attached to it in other senses. There are examples of this symbolical and metaphorical signification, with regard to both reception of benefit and endurance of suffering. For the first, we find it written in the Acts, “Ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence:”<sup>5</sup> and, in the Gospel, S. John Baptist de-

---

<sup>2</sup> S. Mark. vij. 4. Compare S. John. ij. 6.

<sup>3</sup> Judith. xij. 7.

<sup>4</sup> Ecclus. xxxiv. 25.

<sup>5</sup> Acts. i. 5.

clared of our Lord; "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire."<sup>6</sup> For the latter, our Lord alluding to His Passion, said: "I have a baptism to be baptized with:"<sup>7</sup> and, "Ye know not what ye ask:" was His answer to the sons of Zebedee; "can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?"<sup>8</sup> Again, (according to the interpretation of some commentators,) "Else what shall they do which are baptized for the dead?"<sup>9</sup>

Thirdly, the term is to be understood of the legal and ceremonial ablutions observed under the old law. As, where S. Paul speaks of the "divers washings," "και διαφοροις βαπτισμοις:" "et variis baptismatibus."<sup>10</sup> And the place in S. Mark, before cited, refers to both a literal and ceremonial "washing." The baptism of S. John, which was the baptism of repentance,<sup>11</sup> falls under the same class: being, not a sacrament but a preparation for, and preliminary to, the sacrament of baptism afterwards to be instituted.

<sup>6</sup> S. Matt. iij. 11.

<sup>7</sup> S. Luke. xij. 50. Compare S. Mark. x. 38.

<sup>8</sup> S. Mark. x. 38. So S. Basil, speaking of one of the martyrs, says: "Επιστευσεν εις το ονομα του Κυριου ημων Ιησου Χριστου εβαπτισθη εις αυτον, ουχ υπο αλου, αλλ' υπο της οικειας πιστεως ουκ εν υδατι, αλλ' εν τω ιδιω αιματι." *Homil. de xl. Martyribus.* § 7. I shall speak again of this "baptism of blood."

<sup>9</sup> 1 Cor. xv. 29. Upon the sense of this most difficult text, see Hildebrand, *Ars bene moriendi*, cap. iv. where he gives eleven interpretations which have been proposed. Also, Hartman, *de hierarchia pontificia.* p. 609. In the same epistle is another example; "And were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea." x. 2.

<sup>10</sup> Hebrews. ix. 10.

<sup>11</sup> S. Mark. i. 4.

To which Sacrament, fourthly, we are chiefly and especially to restrict the meaning of the term baptism, according to the use of both Scripture and the Church, from the time when our Saviour thus spoke of it to Nicodemus: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."<sup>12</sup> And, afterwards, to His disciples; "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."<sup>13</sup> It is of this that S. Paul writes to the Ephesians, where he reminds them, that there is "one Lord, one faith, one baptism:" and to S. Titus, where he declares that we are saved "by the washing of regeneration."<sup>14</sup> S. Peter also, that it, namely baptism, "doth now save us."<sup>15</sup>

Besides the name of Baptism, other titles were frequently given anciently to this sacrament: some of which, as Bingham has observed, "were taken from the internal and spiritual effects of it; others, from the nature and substance of the action; others, from the conditions required in the receivers; others, from the external circumstances and rites observed in the administration."<sup>16</sup> Each variety of these names served to express something of the nature or properties of the sacrament itself, and together are of great import-

<sup>12</sup> S. John. iij. 5.

<sup>13</sup> S. Matt. xxvii. 19.

<sup>14</sup> Ephes. iv. 5. Titus. iij. 5.

<sup>15</sup> Epist. 1. iij. 21.

<sup>16</sup> Antiquities. *Book. xi. ch. 1.*  
To which place I would refer the student. See also Albertinus: *de eucharistia*, p. 285. 549. 751. &c.



ance in enabling us to understand in what light it was regarded by the fathers in the first ages of the Christian Faith. The same learned writer supplies several examples: as, the Divine Indulgence, or, Absolution: Regeneration:<sup>17</sup> Unction: Illumination:<sup>18</sup> Salvation: Mystery: Seal: Gift: the Layman's priesthood:<sup>19</sup> Initiation: Consummation or Perfection: etc. There is a passage in S. Gregory Nazianzen in which that father heaps up, as it were, these numerous titles given to the sacrament of baptism: He tells us, “Δωρον καλουμεν, χαρισμα, βαπτισμα, χρισμα, φωτισμα, αφθαρσιας ενδυμα, λουτρον παλιγγενεσιας, σφραγιδα, παν οτι τιμιον.”<sup>20</sup> So again,

<sup>17</sup> Tertullian says: “Nos pisciculi, secundum ιχθυν nostrum Jesum Christum, in aqua nascimur.” *De bapt. cap. 1.* And the reader will remember the often quoted place in Optatus: “Hic est piscis, qui in baptisate per invocationem fontalibus undis inseritur, ut quæ aqua fuerit, a pisce etiam piscina vocitetur. Cujus piscis nomen, secundum appellationem Græcam, in uno nomine per singulas litteras, turbam sanctorum nominum continet ιχθυσ, quod est Latine, Jesus Christus Filius Dei Salvator.” *Lib. iij. p. 62. cit.* Bingham. *B. xi. ch. 1. iij.*

“Solum balneorum vocant piscinam, vel quodlibet in quo continetur aqua.” *Gloss. Mss.* “Piscina dicitur in balneis in qua piscium nihil est, cum nihil piscibus simile habeat: videtur tamen a piscibus dicta propter aquam, ubi

piscibus vita est.” S. Aug. *lib. de dialect. c. 5. cit.* Dom. Macri. *Hierolexicon.*

<sup>18</sup> The opening the eyes of the blind man by our Lord when He spat upon the ground and made clay, (S. John, ix.) was regarded by some of the fathers as a type of baptism. See S. Chrys. *hom. 56. in Joan.* S. Ambrose. *epist. 73.* S. Augustine. *tract. xlv. in Evang. S. Joan.* This perhaps from the earlier title of “illumination” given to the Sacrament.

<sup>19</sup> “Sacerdotium laici, id est, baptisma. Scriptum est enim, ‘Regnum quippe nos et sacerdotes Deo et Patri suo fecit.’ Et iterum, ‘Gentem sanctam, regale sacerdotium.’” S. Hieron. *adv. Lucifer. cap. ij.*

<sup>20</sup> Orat. xl. de Bapt. *cit.* Bingham.

S. Basil : “Βαπτισμα αιχμαλωτοις λυτρον, οφληματων αφεσις, θανατος αμαρτιας, παλιγγενεσια ψυχης, ενδυμα φωτεινον, σφραγισ ανεπιχειρητος, οχημα προς ουρανον, βασιλειας προξενον, υιοθεσιας χαρισμα.”<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Homil. in sanct. bapt. § 5. Compare S. Cyril. *Catech.* Præfat. § x. Also Cabasilas : *de vita in Christo. lib.* 2. *Bibl. Patrum. tom.* 26. *p.* 141.

Another title less usual, but equally significative of the infinite privileges attached to the reception of baptism, was “viaticum.” This, although chiefly used with reference to the holy Eucharist, was nevertheless not restrained to that sacrament alone. Absolution, confirmation, and extreme-unction, were sometimes also so called. Because, as Albaspinæus has remarked, the term may fitly be applied to that which, being received just before death, profits us in our journey towards another world. “Sic patres non prohibent,” he continues, “imo imperant, ut sacro fonte intingantur in morte, quod baptismus ad salutem omnino requiratur et valeat: propterea *Viaticum* appellant, etc.” *Observat. lib.* 1. *p.* 74. Cf. *Monumenta Ritualia, vol.* 1. *p.* ccxxvij. *note* 54.

It has, indeed, been suggested, that very anciently and originally baptism was styled “viaticum,” because the holy eucharist, (the

proper viaticum) was given immediately after baptism to sick persons, and even to infants. In the western Church the practice as to the last, probably continued in places till the xjth century or even later. Alcuin, speaking of infants, says; “—hoc providendum est, ut nullum cibum accipiant, neque lactentur, antequam communicent.” *De div. off. edit. Hittorpius. p.* 64.

I cannot say to what extent the custom of communicating infants was introduced into England: among the epistles of Lanfranc is one, the 33rd to Domnaldus an Irish bishop, in which the doctrine of its *necessity* is very positively condemned. “Revera, et procul pulsa omni ambiguitate sciatis, neque transmarinas ecclesias, neque nos Anglos hanc de infantibus tenere sententiam, quam putatis. etc.” *Opera. p.* 317. Compare a passage in the homilies of S. Anselm. “Expleta in baptismo purgatione introducunt eos ad sanctum altare consecrandos victima divinæ eucharistiæ.” *Opera. p.* 171.

The Abyssinian Churches, following the Greeks, are said still

To these let me add some of the titles which, from time to time, have been given to baptism in canons and other authoritative documents of the church of England.

to retain this custom: so Franciscus Alvarez asserts, quoted by F. Calixtus, *disput. theol.* sign. F. 3. And so the Ethiopic ritual directs in its order of baptism: as it is in the *Bibliotheca Patrum. tom. 27.*

Compare upon the whole subject of infant communion, Arcudius, *Concordia. ecc. lib. 1. cap. xiv.* Hildebrand, *Ars bene moriendi*, p. 58. Bona, *Rerum Liturg. lib. 2. cap. xix.* Bingham, *Antiq. vol. 5. p. 171.* and Waterland's dissertation, *Works, vol. 6. p. 39.* This last very learned writer argues that the giving the holy Eucharist to mere infants, on the ground of its absolute necessity to salvation, began about the 7th century. p. 63. Hence, when the communion of the Body and Blood of our Lord by children is spoken of by earlier writers, (as by Fulgentius, Innocent I., S. Austin, S. Cyprian, etc.) we must conclude that they either referred this communion to its reception in baptism; or that the children were of the age of six, eight, or ten years.

There is a curious passage in an epistle of Gilbert of Poitiers, from which it would seem, that

then it was usual to communicate children, after baptism, with the chalice only. "Quoniam et pueri baptizati in solius calicis, et infirmi in solius panis sacramento sæpe communicant: et nihil minus quantum ad rem ipsam et ad incorruptionis futuræ sacramentum accipiunt, quam illi a quibus in utroque panis scilicet et calicis sacramento in ecclesia de ipsa mensa Dominica Christus assumitur." *Thes. Anecd. tom. 1. p. 428.* Other writers mention the same custom: Hugo S. Victor, *de sacram. lib. 1. cap. xx.* Hence probably arose the practice, of which we find traces about the 12th century, of giving unconsecrated wine to infants; thus keeping up in appearance the earlier form, without the reality.

With respect to Fulgentius, the reader should consult especially the xith ch. of his treatise *de bapt. Ethiopis*: in which he most clearly argues that oral participation of the holy Eucharist is not of necessity, where it cannot be had. He instances in the case of sick adults, dying immediately after baptism. *Bibl. Patrum. tom. ix. p. 177.*

From the custom of commu-

Not omitting to notice the strong expression of archbishop Theodore in his penitential, "præceptum est animas eripere a diabolo per baptismum,"<sup>22</sup> I would pass on at once to the later councils of our Church.

nicating immediately the newly-baptized, arose that other of dedicating with solemn rites the baptisteries: and the relics of saints and martyrs were buried in them, as in churches. Thus Gregory of Tours says, that in the baptistery at Dijon "multæ reliquiæ sanctorum tenebantur." *De vitis patrum. cap. vij. cit. Catal. in rit. Rom. tom. 1. p. 32.* See also the very ancient martyrology of the abbey of Corbey. "xvij. cal. Maii. In Autissiodoro dedicatio baptisterii — ubi sunt conditæ reliquiæ S. Iohan. evang." *Thes. Anecd. tom. 3. p. 1575.* Also, altars were erected in the baptisteries, for the purpose of celebrating the eucharist. Mabillon tells us of the baptistery at Pisa: "Prope adest baptisterium in primis insigne: in cujus medio exstat fons sacer rotundo opere, cum multis fonticulis in petra ex-cisis, in quos forsan baptizandi olim immergebantur. Adhæret altare cum globo supra illud concavo, in quo eucharistia olim ad usum (ut veri simillimum est) recens baptizatorum asservabatur." *Iter. Ital. p. 184.* So, also, the account of the baptistery at Ravenna, given by Ambrose Ca-

maldulensis, in the 14th century: *lib. xij. epist. 3. Martene, Vet. Script. tom. 3. p. 450.* I think the following statute of the diocese of Cambrai, in the same century, worth mentioning, though I am not aware of any record of its introduction into the churches of this country. "Juxta fontes instituatur piscina aperta, ubi laventur manus eorum qui tenuerunt puerum, et vas lavetur quo infusus fuit puer. Super piscinam autem illam ponatur cooperculum." *Ibid. tom. vii. p. 1292.*

See the rubrics of the Sarum pontifical and manual, as they were in the xvth century; as compared with the Leofric MS. of the xjth. *Monum. ritualia. vol. 1. p. 25.* And the Jumieges MS. in Martene, *ant. ecc. rit. tom. 1. p. 73.* Compare also the rubric after our office for baptism of those of riper years.

<sup>22</sup> Thorpe. *Ancient Laws and Institutes, vol. 2. p. 51.* So, in the penitential of archbishop Egbert; "Prima remissio peccatorum est, per baptismi lavacrum." *ibid. p. 223.* Compare also venerable Bede. *Homil. edit. Giles. tom. 5. p. 42.*

Thus we find baptism spoken of by the council of Durham in the year 1220, as, “janua omnium sacramentorum, et prima tabula post naufragium, sine quo non est salus:” by a canon of the diocese of Chichester in 1246, as “sacramentum ingredientium:”<sup>23</sup> by the provincial constitutions of Othobon, “ingredientibus hoc mare magnum, mundum videlicet naufragiis plenum, prima tabula nos ad portum salutis adducens:” and, once more, by a canon of the diocese of Winchester, in 1308, baptism is declared to be, “janua omnium sacramentorum,—salutis lavacrum,—sine quo ab ecclesia ad regnum cœlorum minime pervenitur.”<sup>24</sup>

About the period of the reformation also, Pole, archbishop of Canterbury, spoke of this sacrament as being

---

<sup>23</sup> “Sunt autem ecclesiastica sacramenta septem: baptismus ingredientium, confirmatio præliantium, eucharistia itinerantium, pœnitentia redeuntium, extrema unctio exeuntium, ordo ministrantium, conjugium laborantium.” Wilkins. *Concil. tom. 1. p. 688.*

<sup>24</sup> Wilkins. *Concil. tom. 1. p. 574. 688. tom. 2. p. 2. 293.*

A provincial constitution of the church of Scotland, in the 13th century, speaks of this sacrament as having great virtue and efficacy, “cum ab ipso Deo institutum est, et ejus sanguine rubricatum.” *ibid. tom. 1. p. 614. cf. p. 666.*

clares it to be “spiritualis generatio per quam homo regeneratur Christo.” *fol. xj.* This book is frequent in manuscript, and was more than once printed for the use of the English clergy in the middle ages: it is of much value as evidence of the opinions then held and taught. See *Monumenta Rit. vol. 3. p. lxxx. note.* Bishop Jewell says of it (I quote him on this point, merely as a witness, almost contemporary, to the fact,) “*Manipulus Curatorum*, not long sithence thought to be a book most necessary for all parsons and curates, as containing all necessary doctrine for the church of God.” *Works. vol. 3. p. 401.*

The *Manipulus Curatorum* de-



the first of all the sacraments, and the gate of spiritual life; by which we are made members of Christ, and of His body, the Church.<sup>25</sup>

Nor, returning to an almost primitive age, ought I to omit the testimony of the venerable Bede: in a homily which has for its subject the discourse of our Lord with Nicodemus. “Videtur quidem baptizandus in fontem descendere, videtur aquis intingi, videtur de aquis ascendere: quid autem in illo lavacrum regenerationis egerit, minime potest videri. Sola hoc fidelium novit pietas, quia peccator in fontem descendit, sed purificatus ascendit: filius mortis descendit, sed filius resurrectionis ascendit: filius prævaricationis descendit, sed filius reconciliationis ascendit: filius iræ descendit, sed filius misericordiæ ascendit: filius diaboli descendit, sed filius Dei ascendit. Sola hæc ecclesia mater, quæ generat novit; cæterum oculis inspicientium videtur talis exire de fonte, qualis intravit, totumque ludus esse quod agitur:—qui ex aqua et spiritu regeneratur, invisibiliter in novum hominem mutatur, et de carnali efficitur spiritualis.”<sup>26</sup>

The types and figures of Holy Baptism, under the old dispensations, were various. The Cloud, and the Red Sea, and the Levitical washings, of which S. Paul has told us;<sup>27</sup> the Ark, and the Flood, of which S.

<sup>25</sup> *Reformatio Angliæ. p. 7. edit. Aldus. 1562.* Compare, in the same terms, Bishop Bonner, *Necessary doctrine. sign. M. iij. edit. 1555.*

<sup>26</sup> *Opera. tom. 5. p. 110. cf. p. 165.* “—baptizari, id est, a peccati originalis contagione mundari.”

<sup>27</sup> 1 Cor. x. 2. Hebrews. ix. 10.

Peter writes ;<sup>28</sup> and, not to speak of other types, Circumcision, and “ the baptism of John,” were especially foreshadowings of the sacrament by which, in after ages, under the gospel, men were to be admitted into their new state, the state of salvation.”<sup>29</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Epist. 1. iij. 20.

“ Ramum olivæ columba corporalis ablutam diluvii aquis detulit in arcam, Spiritus Sanctus in specie columbæ corporalis baptizatum aqua Jordanis descendit in Dominum. Nos quoque Christi et ecclesiæ membra, quos non solum homines, qui erant in arca cum Noe, sed et animantia quæ arca continebat, et ipsa quoque ligna, ex quibus eadem facta est arca, figurant post acceptum undæ regenerationis lavacrum : per unctionem sacri chrismatis gratia Spiritus Sancti signamur, quam conservare in nobis intemeratam dignetur ipse, qui dedit J. C. Dominus noster, etc.” Ven. Bedæ, *Homil.* xxij. *Opera.* tom. 5. p. 172.

<sup>29</sup> The pool of Bethesda was frequently alluded to as a type of baptism, by the fathers ; by S. Cyril, S. Ambrose, S. Gregory, S. Chrysostom, and others. The following passage is from a very ancient author, less known than the above. “ Hæc piscina baptismatis aquas significabat. Unde non immerito probatica, id est ovina dicebatur, quoniam oves

Dei fiunt qui in baptismo lavantur,—Hæc autem piscina quinque porticus habet, in quibus—jacebat multitudo languentium, expectantium aquæ motum.—Inde tamen languentes videbant piscinam, descendebant in eam et sanabantur.—Sed notandum quia solus ille sanatur, qui prior post motionem aquæ in piscinam descendit : per quem totus populus Christianus intelligitur, qui solus et unicus, prior et ultimus, unus et inseparabilis in aquis baptismi et lavatur et sanatur. etc.” Eusebius episc. Gallicanus. A. D. 430. *Homil.* Bibl. Patrum. tom. vi. p. 720. Compare Tertullian, *de baptismo*, cap. v.

A somewhat similar train of thought is shewn by Thomas Waldensis : *Doctrinale de sacram.* cap. xcvij. §. 3. *Opera.* tom. 2. p. 577. Again, the pool of Siloam is so referred to, following the ancients, by the author of the epistle on baptism, addressed to Charlemagne. *Thes. Anecd.* tom. 1. p. 15. And Rupert Tuiensis makes the dipping of Naaman the leper, in the river Jordan, to be a type of the sevenfold gifts

Many definitions of baptism have been proposed. Philip Melancthon defined it to be, "Signum quo Deus nobiscum agit, et recipit nos in gratiam."<sup>30</sup> But as Bellarmin<sup>31</sup> has observed, and after him Tournely,<sup>32</sup> this definition agrees with every sacrament, nay, even with the mere preaching of the Gospel: and makes baptism to be a bare sign, and not productive of sanctifying grace.

Calvin declares: "Baptisme is a signe of the entringe wherewith we are receiued into the felowship of ye Church, that being graffed into Christ, we may be reckened amonge the children of God."<sup>33</sup> To this, as it has been frequently remarked, the obvious objections lie, that it mentions only one, and a secondary end of baptism, the mere reception into the church of Christ; and not the principal effects, namely, regeneration, purification, and forgiveness of sins. Again, that, (like Melancthon's) it makes baptism to be a bare sign. Again, that the same definition may be given of circumcision; by which men were, in like manner as so described, received into the church of God, graffed into Christ the promised Saviour, and

of the Holy Spirit in the sacrament of baptism. *De div. off. lib. iv. cap. xvj.* Auct. bibl. patrum. tom. i. p. 923.

<sup>30</sup> In locis comm. cit. Bellarmin. Opera. tom. 2. p. 111. Cf. *Melancth. opera. tom. 2. p. 833.* In another place he says of bap-

tism, "Mergimur, ut peccatum abluatur mersione." tom. 3. p. 25.

<sup>31</sup> Ibid.

<sup>32</sup> De Baptismo. p. 11.

<sup>33</sup> Instit. Book. iv. ch. 15. I quote from the English translation, London, 1578: not being able to refer to the original.

regarded as among the number of the peculiar people of God.<sup>34</sup>

Of earlier writers, the definition given by Hugo S. Victor is well known: "Baptismus est aqua abluendis criminibus sanctificata."<sup>35</sup> But, as Aquinas objects, this falls short of the truth, for baptism is not water taken by itself alone. And he goes on to observe: "in aqua non perficitur sanctificatio, sed est ibi quædam sanctificationis virtus instrumentalis non permanens, sed fluens in hominem, qui est veræ sanctificationis subjectum: et ideo sacramentum non perficitur in ipsa aqua, sed in applicatione aquæ ad hominem, quæ est ablutio: et ideo Magister in 3. *dist.* 4. *sent.* dicit, quod 'baptismus est ablutio corporis exterior, facta sub forma præscripta verborum.' Res autem, et sacramentum est character baptismalis, qui est res significata per exteriorem abluionem, et est signum sacramentale interioris justificationis, quæ est res tantum hujus sacramenti, scilicet significata, et non significans."<sup>36</sup> Aquinas himself approves of and adopts the definition which he quotes from the Master of the Sen-

---

<sup>34</sup> Tournely, in the place cited above, gives also the definitions proposed by Socinus, *Opera*, tom. 1. p. 350, and by Wolcheliuſ, *de vera religione*, lib. vj. cap. 14. of which it is sufficient to say, that they are not incomplete like those of Calvin and Melancthon but positively erroneous: plainly asserting baptism to be nothing

more than a public profession of belief in the Christian religion.

<sup>35</sup> *Lib.* 2. de Sacram. vj. c. 2. But compare the definition given, lib. 1. *Theol. de Sacram. cap.* xij. in the Auctarium to *Bibl. Patrum.* tom. 1. p. 1374.

<sup>36</sup> *Summa. pars.* III. *quæst.* 66. art. 1.

tences: and with him agree the majority of the schoolmen.<sup>37</sup>

Duns Scotus, in adopting and defending the definition of the Master, yet makes so many additions as almost to recast it. He says; "Dico quod baptismus est ablutio exterior, facta in aqua, hominis non inviti, ab alio ablutente, et simul cum intentione debita, et certis verbis totam Trinitatem invocante, efficienter signans ex institutione divina ablutionem animæ interiorē à peccato." Most of the members of this definition will be found discussed as we proceed.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup> Almost all, however, make various additions. For example; "Baptismus est sacramentum in externa corporis ablutione, et legitima verborum enunciatione juxta Christi institutionem consistens." Again: "Baptismus est corporalis ablutio hominis in aqua facta, et verbo significata cum expressa invocatione Trinitatis, cumque intentione faciendi quod facit Ecclesia." Once more: "Est ablutio aquæ ex Domini Salvatoris institutione in nomine trium divinarum Personarum, Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti peracta: per quam introducimur in ecclesiam."

<sup>38</sup> Reportat. Paris. *lib. iv. dist. 3. quæst. ij.* Notwithstanding his explanations and corrections, Duns Scotus insists strongly on the identity of the two definitions. "Quantum ergo ad definitionem

Magistri, de qua quæritur, dico quod est bona, si suppleantur, et explicentur illa quæ in ipsa continentur, quia tunc est eadem cum prædicta. Nam cum dicit quod *est ablutio exterior facta in aqua* tangit materiam hujus sacramenti; cum vero dicitur quod *est ablutio*, non cujuscunque, sed *corporis*, tangitur susceptivum hujus sacramenti, et datur intelligi ablutio corporis hominis non inviti, quia non corporis asini, vel bovis, quia ablutio non fit nisi aliquo ablutente; ideo consequenter dat intelligere ministerium hujus sacramenti. Per hoc autem quod dicit *sub forma verborum*, exprimit formam hujus sacramenti, et ita addendo quod addidi, habetur completa ejus definitio." *Ibid.* Compare his earlier definitions and arguments, (with the scholia,) in *lib. iv. sentent. dist. 3. quæst. 1.*



Of the canonists, Hostiensis accepts the same definition, adding, "sine qua [ablutione] nemo salvari potest."<sup>39</sup> Lyndwood says: "In quo consistat istud sacramentum sunt opiniones. Prima est, quod ipsa aqua est sacramentum baptismi. Secunda est, quod passio tinctionis sive ablutionis, est sacramentum baptismi. Tertia est, quod character, qui in baptismo confertur, est sacramentum baptismi. Tu dic, quod in baptismo sunt tria; unum, quod est sacramentum et non res, sc. aqua abluens, sive ablutio. Secundum est res et non sacramentum, sc. peccati remissio et gratiæ infusio. Tertium est res et sacramentum, sc. character animæ impressus in baptismo. Aqua igitur verbo Domini sanctificata, proprie est sacramentum, sicut et species panis in sacramento altaris; et character secundario, sicut et verum Corpus Christi."<sup>40</sup>

<sup>39</sup> Summa. lib. iij. rubr. 42.

<sup>40</sup> Lib. iij. tit. 24. Circa sacramentum. verb. sacramentum baptismi. Compare Aquinas, in the place just cited.

Both Lyndwood and Hostiensis explain baptism to be the chief and most necessary of the sacraments: the latter in the place just cited: and the former says of Penance that it must follow, not precede baptism: "quia baptismus janua est et fundamentum omnium sacramentorum." Lib. v. tit. 16. c. 2. verb. unicuique. So also the Pupilla Oculi. Pars. II. cap. I.

This last work, once of so high

authority in the English church, in its first chapter upon baptism, thus distinguishes the various kinds. "Triplex est baptismus: sc. fluminis, flaminis, et sanguinis. Baptismus fluminis est qui fit in aqua in forma debita: secundum consuetum morem ecclesiæ.—Flaminis: ut cum quis habens fidem, volens baptizari, caret baptismo fluminis, sive aquæ, non per negligentiam seu contemptum; sed quia non valet ipsum attingere; et talem defectum supplet gratia Spiritus Sancti.—Baptismus sanguinis: ut in martyribus non prius baptizatis, qui non pos-

But, not to delay in collecting the opinions suggested by various later authors in the Roman communion, I shall give that which is to be found in the Trent catechism. Relying upon the declaration of our Blessed Lord to Nicodemus, and upon the words of S. Paul to the Ephesians, "Christ loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word,"<sup>41</sup> the catechism defines baptism to be, "*sacramentum regenerationis per aquam in verbo.*"<sup>42</sup> The last words, "*in verbo,*" must be understood as intended to signify the express invocation of the Holy Trinity. And we then find in the above definition, as Bellarmin and other writers have observed, the *genus* in the term "*sacramentum;*" and the *differentia*, in the addition "*regenerationis,*"

sent attingere baptismum aquæ; sed in proprio sanguine baptizantur: vel potius merito sanguinis Christi in cruce effusi.—Inter hos baptismos talis differentia est. Baptismus fluminis debite acceptus a tota pœna liberat; et a culpa tam originali quam actuali. — Baptismus autem flaminis totam culpam delet, et dat gratiam in usu, in quo consistit meritum.— Baptismus vero sanguinis liberat ab omni tentatione, et confert statim præmium. Sed nec baptismus flaminis neque sanguinis imprimit characterem: quia non imprimitur nisi in actuali usu sacramenti: sed baptizatis baptismo sanguinis loco

characteris erit aureola martyrii. Item baptismus flaminis tantum habet locum in adultis. Alii duo in parvulis: de baptismo sanguinis patet; ut de innocentibus occisis pro Christo: de baptismo fluminis; ut communiter fit in ecclesia. Item, baptismus fluminis semper valet et sufficit: alii duo, solum in articulo necessitatis." *Pars. II. cap. 1.* I shall speak of these distinctions, again, presently.

For some account of the Pupilla oculi, I must refer the reader to the Monumenta Rit. *vol. 3. p. lxxix. note 29.*

<sup>41</sup> *Ch. v. 25.*

<sup>42</sup> *Edit. Aldus. 1566. p. 99.*

which distinguishes baptism from any other sacrament, whether properly or improperly so called; inasmuch as baptism alone regenerates. “*Per aquam*” affords another distinction, specifying the matter; and “*in verbo*,” as I have explained it, would supply the form.

It is not easy to refer to the formularies of the church of England, which have been authorized from time to time during the last three centuries, for any brief definition of baptism. If this seems strange, it must be remembered that the documents to be referred to, during the same period, of the church of Rome, are not more explicit: for even the catechism, from which I have just quoted, has not that sanction which could alone have been given to it by the council itself of Trent. Hence, though of very high value, as a standard of teaching in that Church, it falls short when we would appeal to it as giving utterance to her dogmatical decisions.

The twenty-seventh of the 39 articles asserts of baptism, that “it is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from others that be not christened, but it is also a sign of regeneration or new birth, whereby, as by an instrument, [*signum — per quod, tanquam per instrumentum,*] they that receive baptism rightly, are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost [*per Spiritum Sanctum*], are visibly signed and sealed; faith is confirmed; and grace increased by

virtue of prayer unto God.” If there had never been any of the unhappy disputes upon Regeneration which have so miserably divided our Church, this article might well have been looked on as a sufficient statement of her judgment as to that doctrine, and to be necessarily interpreted in strict accordance with her often-repeated decisions in former ages. But it is not to be denied that there were, even at that time, 1562, men of powerful influence who held low and imperfect views of the grace of God as conveyed to man in and by His sacraments; and it was a period also, when, in order both to gain some and to retain others, incomplete and dubious expressions were sought for rather than plain, distinct, and dogmatic assertions, which no man could misinterpret or mistake, of Catholic Truth. Hence we cannot wonder that opposite parties have appealed to the 27th article, each in support of its own views. Wherefore we can scarcely regard it as a definition of the sacrament of baptism, even though there was evidence that it was ever intended to be so. The last clause, if it means any thing, as it stands in the English version, is a truism, and not to be connected with the preceding. But I shall make a brief observation upon this presently.

In the large addition made, some fifty years afterwards, to the catechism, we find a far clearer explanation of the grace given in baptism: one, which is not to be evaded by those, who readily enough refer to the article. Indeed this was to be expected: inasmuch as this part was added to correct the false teach-

ing upon the sacraments, which had spread somewhat widely during the troubled years immediately following the reformation. The grace of baptism, and therefore baptism itself, is declared in the catechism to be, "A death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness: for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are *hereby* made the children of grace." It is not to be forgotten that, not only upon this question but on all others upon which the catechism treats, we are to regard its exposition as being of the most distinct and dogmatic character: by which, therefore, if any doubts arise, we are bound to interpret the less open and preceding statements of the 39 articles.

It will be necessary to refer to one or two books published early in the xvth century, if we would rightly understand both the article and the catechism. The articles of 1536, put forth to "stablyshe Christen quietness and unitie," and "approved by the consent and determination of the hole clergie of this realme," thus speak of baptism. That, "it was instituted and ordained in the New Testament by our Saviour Jesus Christ, as a thing necessary for the attaining of everlasting life, according to the saying of Christ, 'Nisi quis renatus fuit ex aqua,' *etc.*"<sup>43</sup> This, with much that follows, was incorporated into the Institution of a Christian man, or "the Bishops Book,"<sup>44</sup> which was

---

<sup>43</sup> Oxford reprint. "Formularies of Faith," p. 6.

<sup>44</sup> *Ibid.* p 93.



published in the next year. The Necessary Doctrine, put forth six years after, adds that "the effect and virtue of this sacrament is forgiveness of sin, and grace of the Holy Ghost, as is manifestly declared in the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, where it is said, Do penance, and be baptized every one of you, and ye shall have forgiveness of sin, and shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost."<sup>45</sup>

It will be important to add one or two extracts, respecting this point, from the works of archbishop Cranmer. The Institution, from which I have already extracted, I must also observe subjoins; "*Item*, That it is offered unto all men, as well infants as such as have the use of reason, that by baptism they shall have remission of all their sins, the grace and favour of God, and everlasting life, according to the saying of Christ, Whosoever believeth and is baptized shall be saved." Upon this, by the way, Henry VIII. remarks in his corrections, "They dying in that grace which by the sacrament of baptism is conferred to them, and not by sin alter the same."<sup>46</sup>

The archbishop himself declares in his Answers to

<sup>45</sup> Oxford reprint. "Formula-ries of Faith," p. 253. "Do penance." μετανοήσατε. "Pœnitentiam agite," is the rendering of the Vulgate. Wickliffe's translation, according to a MS. now before me, with which agree others which have been collated, follows the Latin: "and petir seide to hem,

do ye penaunce." Tyndale's Testament of 1534, and Cranmer's version of 1539, read "repent." The Geneva of 1557, "Amend your lives." The Rhemish of 1582, it need scarcely be added, follows the Latin: "Doe penance."

<sup>46</sup> Works, vol. 2. p. 38.

the Questions on the Sacraments, that “in baptism we be regenerated and pardoned of our sin by the blood of Christ.” — In his Answer to Dr. Smythe; “In baptism we come not unto the water as we come to other common waters, when we wash our hands or bathe our bodies, but we know that it is a mystical water.” — In his Answer to Gardyner, he excepts against that author’s position that in baptism we receive the Spirit of Christ, and in the sacrament of His Body and Blood we receive His very Body and Blood: and he asserts, “this your saying is no small derogation to baptism, wherein we receive not only the Spirit of Christ, but also Christ Himself, whole body and soul, manhood and Godhead, unto everlasting life, as well as in the holy communion.—Nevertheless this is done in divers respects; for in baptism it is done in respect of regeneration, and in the holy communion in respect of nourishment and augmentation.” I am aware that this assertion of the archbishop<sup>47</sup> may be supported by some few places to the

---

<sup>47</sup> Bishop Jewell argues, as it would at first sight appear, much in the same way; adducing various places from S. Augustine and other fathers; but, carefully considered, I doubt whether he ought to be supposed desirous of asserting more than his denial of an erroneous opinion which he attributes to his adversary, Harding, viz. “that Christ’s body cannot be eaten, but only in the sacra-

ment:” and therefore, they who do not *so* partake, must eternally perish. Harding scarcely could, according to the peculiar teaching of his own Church, have really intended this. Nor, on the other hand, do S. Augustine and S. Chrysostom speak of the same kind of participation of the Body and Blood of our Blessed Lord, as in the Eucharist, when they say, that “in baptism every man, being

same effect in the fathers, but surely not there so boldly and without qualifications or explanation. Indeed in the whole of this first part of his Answer to Gardyner, Cranmer's opinions upon the deep mysteries which he was considering, shew very plainly the extent to which he was inclined to agree with the extreme views of the Sacramentarians, as they were called, of that day; and his increased reliance upon his own private judgment rather than on the declared decisions of the Church. This is very evident (as every one must confess) from the passage which immediately succeeds that which I have last quoted.—Once more, in the same Answer, we find it declared that “as in baptism the priest putteth his hand to the child outwardly, and washeth him with water, so must we think that God putteth to his hand inwardly, and washeth the infant with His Holy Spirit, and moreover that Christ Himself cometh down upon the child, and apparelleth him with His own Self.”<sup>48</sup>

As these extracts are for the sake of illustration, rather than of definition, I would offer here two or three more, of the like kind, from the works of two writers, of authority, during the same century.

Bishop Jewell calls baptism “the sacrament of

---

made the member of Christ's body, is then also made partaker of the Body and Blood of Christ:” and that, “in baptism we are incorporate unto Christ, and made flesh of His flesh and bone of His

bone.” See Jewell's Works, *vol. 3. p. 25*; *vol. 2. p. 329*.

<sup>48</sup> *Ibid. vol. 2. p. 100*; *vol. 3. p. 11. 67*. Compare *p. 86. ibid. p. 553*.

regeneration.” But not to insist on various passages to this effect, in his Treatise upon the sacraments, in which he was called upon to explain his opinions more clearly, than in a merely passing way upon other arguments, he declares, “When in baptism our bodies are washed with water, we are taught that our souls are washed in the blood of Christ.” Again: “Baptism is our regeneration or new birth, whereby we are born anew in Christ, and are made the sons of God, and heirs of the kingdom of heaven; it is a sacrament of the remission of sins, and of that washing which we have in the blood of Christ.—Infants cannot become spiritual, but by this new birth of the water and the Spirit.”<sup>49</sup>

Hooker lays down, that “many times there are three things said to make up the substance of a sacrament, namely, the grace which is thereby offered, the element which shadoweth or signifieth grace, and the word which expresseth what is done by the element.” Of the grace only, need we inquire further into what this great divine understood by it: and I may pass on to that the more readily, as his remarks seem scarcely enough to reach to the full extent of Catholic teaching

---

<sup>49</sup> Works, *vol.* 1. *p.* 225; *vol.* 8. *p.* 4. 9. *etc.*

“Some make doubt of those infants, the children of the faithful, which depart before baptism, whether they be saved or not.—It is a hard matter, and too curious for man to enter into the

judgments of God: His mercy is infinite, *etc.*—The soberest way is to speak least, and to leave them to the judgment and mercy of God. Howbeit, if any should despise, and of wilfulness refuse this holy ordinance, that were damnable.” *Vol.* 8. *p.* 14.

with regard to the "element" and "the word." For, in the eucharist, for example, "the word" has more effect than simply to express what is done by the element, inasmuch as it endues the element with its mysterious power; making, in conjunction with the other essential rites, the bread to be the Body, and the wine to be the Blood of our Blessed Lord.<sup>50</sup> So, in baptism: "the element" not alone shadoweth and signifieth, but conveyeth, grace. Of this grace Hooker speaks, most justly, shortly after: "as we are not naturally men without birth, so neither are we Christian men in the eye of the Church of God but by new birth, nor according to the manifest ordinary course of the divine dispensation new-born, but by that baptism which both declareth and maketh us Christians. In which respect we justly hold it to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life."<sup>51</sup>

Nor must I pass on without referring also to two books, claiming, as they do, a higher authority than as being merely the works of individual divines. First, the Homilies: which, speaking of the sacrifice and satisfaction made by our Saviour Christ, declare, "that infants, being baptized and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, and made His children, and inheritors

---

<sup>50</sup> See the "Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England," p. cvij. *et seq.* 2nd edit.

<sup>51</sup> Eccl. Polity. *Book v. ch. 58. §. 3. ch. 60. §. 3.*



of His kingdom of heaven.”<sup>52</sup> Plainly making the conveyance of the blessing to depend upon baptism.

Second, the catechism of dean Nowell. “M. De baptismo ergo primum dic quid censeas. A. Quum natura filii iræ, id est, alieni ab ecclesia, quæ Dei familia est, simus, baptismus veluti aditus quidam nobis est, per quem in eam admittimur; unde et testimonium etiam amplissimum accipimus, in numero domesticorum, adeoque filiorum Dei nos jam esse; imo in Christi corpus quasi cooptari, atque inseri, ejusque membra fieri, et in unum cum ipso corpus coalescere.” Again, having explained water to be the outward sign, or matter, of the sacrament, the catechism proceeds; “M. Quæ est arcana et spiritualis gratia? A. Ea duplex est; remissio videlicet peccatorum, et regeneratio, quæ utraque in externo illo signo, solidam et expressam effigiem suam tenent.”<sup>53</sup>

I return, for an instant, to the 27th article. It has been already shewn that it is not to be understood, as having been intended to be, in any degree of completeness, a definition of baptism: rather, as declaratory of certain truths, which were about the middle of the sixteenth century either disputed or denied. But it is, more particularly, of the last clause that I would say a few words; taking it as it is commonly pointed in the English version, “Faith is confirmed, and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.” Nor need

---

<sup>52</sup> The Sermon of Salvation.  
*Edit.* Oxf. 1832. p. 25.

<sup>53</sup> *Edit.* Randolph. Enchir. tom.  
2. p. 212.

we insist now upon the Latin “vi divinæ invocationis,” or inquire whether the phrase may not originally have had respect not to prayer, in its common acceptation, but to the appointed Form in this sacrament, in which sense it is correct enough. Let us take it, I repeat, as it is in the English: and it certainly does seem to be a mere truism, and not to be connected with the preceding part of the article.

For if it is to be so connected, it might be argued (whether fairly or unfairly upon such an obscure sentence, against other evidence to the contrary) that the church of England has approved of the heretical notion that prayer is essential to the valid administration of the sacrament of baptism. It is not to be denied that in books of about the same period, the sixteenth century, traces are to be discovered of this opinion; as, for example, in the *Reformatio Legum*; a work which (we cannot be too thankful) is not of the slightest authority, and now serves only as a record of some of the extremes, both in faith and practice, into which our Church was upon the verge of being betrayed, if events had not been overruled to a better end by the power of the Almighty. However; this book says, in the chapter *de sacramentorum natura*; “Præterea verbo Dei quod intercedit et symbolorum adhibitorum naturis erudiuntur fideles de pretio nostræ redemptionis per Christum comparatæ, Spiritus Sanctus et gratia in mentibus fidelium ulterius instillatur, etc.”<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> *De hæres. cap. xvij.*

It has indeed been pretended that the same notion is, even at present, countenanced by the rubric of our Office of administration of private baptism. This assumption rests upon an ignorance of the history of this rubric, with its various alterations from time to time, and upon the ambiguity of the punctuation. It is there ordered that the minister shall "call upon God, and say the Lord's Prayer, and so many of the collects appointed to be said before in the Form of public baptism, as the time and present exigence will suffer." Nothing can be more suitable, in general, than such a rule: but, whilst it by no means supposes prayer to God to be an essential part of this sacrament, so, there can be no doubt, that if "the present exigence will not suffer" any prayer to be said, the lawful minister will fully and completely baptize, by the sole use of the appointed Matter, and the appointed Form. This is a question, however, which I shall have to speak upon again presently.

To conclude, therefore, this first part of my dissertation. It has been well said that writers in the ancient Church *described* and did not attempt to *define* baptism, either as to the gifts, or the nature of it. Nor was the Church's language fixed on the subject, beyond the statement in the Nicene creed, "one baptism for the remission of sins."<sup>55</sup> Still, if we remember the plain

---

<sup>55</sup> Scriptural views of Holy Baptism, p. 20. "Thus baptism may obviously be looked upon either with reference to the past or the future; as a passage *from* death, or *to* life; as a deliverance

declarations given in our Common Prayer Book, of the necessity of this sacrament;—that it is generally necessary to salvation; and that it is of great necessity, where it may be had;—we may perhaps venture to give such a definition of it as the following: namely, that Baptism is a Sacrament, generally necessary to salvation, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, in which man is spiritually regenerated by God, by the outward washing of water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

---

*from sin, or a renewal to holiness; a death unto sin, or a new birth unto righteousness: and men's minds might from circumstances be directed prominently to the one or other view." Ibid.*

CHAPTER II.



PROCEED now to the particulars of baptism. And first, of the proper Matter.

Theologians, with regard to the sacraments, have been accustomed to distinguish and divide this ; namely, into remote and proximate : as, for example, in the Holy Eucharist the matter is, remotely, bread and wine ; proximately, the consumption of the consecrated elements.<sup>1</sup> Again in

---

<sup>1</sup> I should be misrepresenting the fact if I did not explain that, as regards the Eucharist, the above division has not been commonly consented to. This is not the place to insist upon or argue the correctness of it : let it suffice to say, that it appears to me to be a true solution of not a few of the difficulties which surround that deep mystery, and are involved in the discussion of it.

The church of Rome allows the distinction of remote and proximate matter, in six of the seven sacraments which she has declared to be instituted by our Lord. The eucharist is the exception : nor, remembering the precision with which that church has defined the

mode of the Divine Presence in the consecrated bread and wine, can we be surprised that such is the result. The council of Trent, upon the excellence of the Holy Eucharist over the other sacraments, has decreed : “ Commune hoc quidem est sanctissimæ eucharistiæ cum ceteris sacramentis, symbolum esse rei sacræ, et invisibilis gratiæ formam visibilem : verum illud in ea excellens, et singulare reperitur, quod reliqua sacramenta tunc primum sanctificandi vim habent, cum quis illis utitur ; at in Eucharistia ipse sanctitatis auctor ante usum est.” *Sess. xiiij. cap. 3.* We may consent readily to the truth contained in the last clause of this sentence,



confirmation, as anciently administered in the church of England: then, in one respect, it was held to be oil; in the other, to be unction. So, in baptism, the *materia remota* is water; and the *materia proxima* is ablution.<sup>2</sup>

Adopting this distinction, we will consider in the first place, the *materia remota*.

The command of our Blessed Lord to His apostles, even though it stood alone, and though there were no other places in the New Testament bearing upon and explaining it, is yet, we might have supposed, sufficiently clear to have prevented all dispute upon this point. "Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them." But it does not stand alone. In His discourse with Nicodemus, He had before expressly declared that this "baptizing" must be with water: "Except a man be

---

without agreeing to the conclusion which it is said must be drawn from it. But I do not now wish to enter further upon this question.

<sup>2</sup> Duns Scotus says: "Aqua est materia respectu verborum, et materia baptismi remota, quia per appropriationem tantum, sed materia baptismi propinqua est ablutio in aqua facta, cum verbis, et applicatio verborum ad elementum, quod essentialiter est signum invisibilis gratiæ, et ablutionis animæ interioris, et non aqua tantum, sicut dixit Bernar. Glossator: propter quod prohibuit istam aquam permitti bibi ab asino, ne

asinus biberet sacramentum." *Reportat. Paris. lib. iv. dist. iiij. quæst. 3.* The reader will see how this bears upon the subject of the note just preceding. But, as Scotus goes on to observe, this is speaking *nimis Bernardicè*: because water is not alone the sacrament of baptism, nor is it the proximate matter of the invisible grace and of the inward washing given in that sacrament; because then all water would be the sacrament of baptism, and of its invisible grace. Whereas, on the contrary, ablution with the Form [ablutio exterior cum verbis] is the "*materia propinqua*."

born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And it is remarkable that in the same chapter we find it written, "After these things came Jesus and His disciples into the land of Judæa; and there He tarried with them, and baptized. And John also was baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water there: and they came and were baptized." Again, His own example, as recorded by S. Matthew; "Jesus, when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." And S. Mark uses almost the same words. Once more, the apostle, writing to the Ephesians, says: "Christ loved the church, and gave Himself for it; that He might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water by the word."<sup>3</sup>

But, from the earliest ages, there have been heretics who either explained away or totally denied this truth, that pure water only is the proper matter of the sacrament of baptism. The various fancies of the different sects upon this subject have been collected by many writers, and I shall not do more than name two or three among them.

Such, for example, as the Gnostics of whom S. Irenæus speaks;<sup>4</sup> or, again, Tertullian: "Nuper con-

<sup>3</sup> *Ch. v. v. 25.*

<sup>4</sup> *Hæres. lib. 1. cap. xxj.* "Primum sanctissimumque regenerationis nostræ mysterium, quod est baptisma, per istos Gnosticos Sathanas omni ex parte labefactare conabatur: quando illi verba illius

formæ à Christo tradita corrumpebant; isti vero et proxime sequentes ipsam materiam, id est, aquam omnino negligendam esse censebant." *Annot. Fr. Feuardentii. in cap. xxj. p. 67.*

versata istic quædam de Caiana hæresi vipera venenatissima doctrina sua plerosque rapuit, in primis baptismum destruens: nam fere viperæ et aspides, ipsique reguli serpentes arida et inaquosa sectantur.”<sup>5</sup>

The note upon this passage tells us, that Tertullian alludes here to Quintilla, from whom these heretics were styled Quintillians; and Pepuzians, from Pepuza, the place from which they spread. In the next chapter of the same treatise, Tertullian adds concerning her; “Quintilla monstrosissima, cui nec integre quidem docendi jus erat, optime notat pisciculos necare, de aqua auferens.” He goes on to trace the ground of her error, to the apparent simplicity of the means by the use of which such blessings were to be obtained. And, once more, the Manicheans; who, teaching that water was created by the evil being, rejected, by a natural consequence, baptism with water, as at least useless. “Baptismum in aqua,” says S. Augustin, “nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre; nec quemquam eorum quos decipiunt, baptizandum putant.”<sup>6</sup>

Passing onwards, we find in the twelfth century a sect of Cathari, one of whose peculiar heresies was, that baptism should not be by water, but, after some sort of manner, by fire.<sup>7</sup> I allude the more particu-

<sup>5</sup> De Baptismo. *Opera.* p. 224.

<sup>6</sup> De Hæres. *Opera.* tom. viij. p. 17.

<sup>7</sup> I extract an account from Tourneley of some earlier here-

tics, who adopted similar notions. “Seleuciani et Hermiani ab auctoribus sic dicti, ac eodem cum Manichæis principio nixi, ‘Baptismum in aqua non recipiunt,’ inquit S. Augustinus L. de hære-

larly to these, because a contemporary author, Eckbert, an abbot, has left us a very curious account of

sibus: et ante ipsum Philastrius in catalogo hæreseon quæ sub apostolis extiterunt, ait, 'eos illo aquæ baptismo non uti, propter verbum hoc quod dixit Joannes Baptista, *Ipse vos baptizabit in spiritu et igne:*' quibus verbis constat quidem eos in aqua non baptizasse; sed an in igne, et quomodo baptizaverint, incertum est. Sane antiquissimum esse morem in baptismo ignem seu unctionem usurpandi, constat ex Heraclione apud Clementem Alexand. in lib. de prophet. 'Quidam,' inquit 'obsignatorum aures igni notabant.' Et de Valentino Tertullianus ait: 'His docuit tingi traducto corpore flamma.' Jacobitæ etiam a Jacobo Zanzalo Syro propagati, loco baptismatis aquæ, ferro candente imprimunt in frontibus figuram crucis. Ignem quoque adhibere perhibentur Æthiopes." *De bapt. p. 17.*

As regards the text from S. Matt. iij. v. 11. upon which these and other sects relied, there are various interpretations given by the earlier commentators. See Theophylus Antioch. in *Bibl. Patrum. tom. 2. p. 167.* But not to mention these, take the *Glossa Ordin.* "*Et igne, i. probatione tribulationis: vel spiritu in præsentia abluit, etc.*" De Lyra

says, himself; "*Et igne: quia super baptizatos in primitiva ecclesia frequenter apparebat S. in signo visibili, sicut apparuit super apostolos in linguis ignis.*" So also, Hugo S. Charo makes it to signify, among other meanings, the fire of tribulation. Several of these middle-age commentators further refer the text also to purgatory: a notion which may be possibly traced to S. Jerome, whom Bellarmin claims as so expounding it. Which, however, plainly he does not. S. Jerome's words are, upon the text: "Sive quia ignis est Spiritus Sanctus, ut Acta apostolorum docent, quo descendente, sedit, quasi ignis super singulos credentium; et impletus est sermo Domini dicentis, *Ignem veni mittere super terram, etc.* Sive quia in præsentia, spiritu baptizamur, et in futuro, igne. Apostolo quoque huic sensui congruente: Uniuscujusque opus quale sit, ignis probabit." *Comm. in Matt.*

The "fire" is probably to be understood either, metaphorically with S. Chrysostom, (as I have already said), for the graces and gifts of the Holy Ghost; or, literally, with S. Cyril of Jerusalem, of the cloven tongues, which visibly descended upon the apostles

the manner in which they performed their rites. This Eckbert wrote a work against the several doctrines of the Cathari, and having argued against their denial of the validity of infant baptism, he proceeds to refute the error of which I have just spoken. I shall not trouble the reader with this, but extract his account of the ceremony which they used. “Hujus erroris defensionem sumitis ex verbis Ioannis, quæ de Domino salvatore pronuntiavit, dicens, ‘Ille vos baptizabit in Spiritu Sancto et igne.’ Hinc est quod eos quos assumitis in societatem Cathariæ vestræ, sicut audivi a quodam qui expertus fuerat secreta vestra, tali modo rebaptizatis. Convenientibus vobis in unum in obscuro aliquo penetrali, primum hoc diligentissime procuratur, ne forte per aliquam fenestram, aut per ostium quisquam eorum qui foris sunt, visu vel auditu percipiat, quod intus geritur:—locantur luminaria copiose in parietibus cunctis: statur per ordinem in circuitu cum reverentia magna, quoniam sancta res agitur, quæ tamen magis complaceat diabolo quam Deo. Statuitur in medio infelix ille, qui baptizandus sive Catharizandus est, et assistit ei archicatharus, tenens in manu libellum deputatum ad officium hoc. Quem imponens vertici ejus dicit benedictiones, quæ potius maledictiones vocandæ sunt, orantibus cæteris qui circumstant,

---

at the day of Pentecost. See Suicer, *Thes. eccles.* p. 630. But, in whatever sense, it must, at least, be referred to the effect and

efficacy of the baptism of our Lord, over and beyond the baptism of John. This will be treated of, in the xiith chapter.



et faciunt filium gehennæ, non regni Dei, sicque perficitur ille baptismus.”<sup>8</sup>

About the same period were various sects of heretics, who, some in one way, some in another, erred as regarded the necessity of water, or of water only, in the sacrament of baptism: such, for instance, as the Waldenses, who would not admit it.<sup>9</sup> But in the thirteenth century the flagellants arose, in many parts of Germany, Poland, Hungary, and France, whose peculiar tenet appears to have been this; “unumquemque baptizari debere proprio sanguine per flagella de corpore excusso.” It is not however quite certain whether these rejected, altogether, baptism by water also:<sup>10</sup> and Gerson, who wrote a treatise against them, does not accuse them of it in direct terms, although he asserts that they neglected sacramental confession and

<sup>8</sup> Bibl. Patrum. tom. xxiii. p. 615. Eckbert continues, that this mock baptism was called baptism with fire, “propter ignem luminum, quæ in circuitu ardent:” and he observes; “Melius ipsa verba attendite: *Baptizabit*, inquit, *in igne*, non juxta ignem, ut vos facitis.”

The common opinion of the Cathari of the middle ages was to deny the grace of baptism, and of sacraments generally, altogether. *Summa Renerii*. (A contemporary author, and once of the sect.) *Thes. Anecd. tom. 5. p. 1762.*

<sup>9</sup> Bibl. Patrum. tom. xxiv. p. 1542. Ebrardus contra Valdenses. *cap. vj.*

<sup>10</sup> See Tournely: *de baptismo. p. 19.*

But from the account by another writer it would appear that they did reject it: “Nona, et ultima (quod sciam) de hac re [baptismo sc.] hæresis est quorundam, qui dicti sunt flagellantes se. Hi dixerunt baptismum aquæ jam cessasse, mutatumque esse in baptismum sanguinis. etc.” Alphons. de Castro. *advers. hæres. lib. 3. cit. Trombelli, de baptismo, tom. iv. p. 317.*

penance, and regarded their own self-inflicted sufferings as of more worth than martyrdom itself.<sup>11</sup>

Not to consider or even to name the many other sects, whom writers on this subject have produced as objecting against the propriety of the use of water in baptism, several examples have occurred of modifications of that error. It will suffice to mention one or two of these.

First; some were grounded upon necessity: as in cases where water is not to be had. A well known instance is that of the Jew, of whom Nicephorus tells us; “Cum Judæus, per loca arida iter faceret, ac subito deficientibus viribus moriturus crederetur, ter superfusa in eum arena, baptizatus est, ac per hanc tam insolitam et admirandam sanctorum mysteriorum initiationem, imbecillitate omni tanquam vinculo quodam solutus, validius quam alii, iter fecit.” Now without entering into any discussion upon this, it is enough to say, that whatever effect the faith of the Jew might be allowed to have, it was not held that the

<sup>11</sup> “Constat, per experientiam, quod taliter se flagellantes non curant de sacramento confessionis vel pœnitentiæ sacramentalis, dicentes quod hæc flagellatio potior est ad delendum peccata, quam quæcumque confessio, imo eam æquiparant nonnulli vel præponunt martyrio, quoniam facimus, inquit, ultro fundendo sanguinem proprium, quod ab aliis mar-

tyres pati cogebantur.” *Opera. tom. I. p. 636.*

“Dicunt, cum Christus in Cana Galilææ circa finem convivii nuptialis aquam mutavit in vinum rubeum, designavit quod circa finem mundi baptismus aquæ in baptismum sanguinis mutari deberet; etc.” Chron. magn. Belg. cit. Raynald. *ad an. 1414. n. xiv.*

sprinkling him with sand was a baptism. For the historian proceeds: "Postquam autem domum sunt reversi, rem illam ad Dionysium Alexandriæ episcopum retulerunt. Ille vero admiratione stupens, Ecclesiam ea de re consuluit; cui visum est aqua insuper, juxta ecclesiæ traditionem, esse abluendum."<sup>12</sup>

Another case, frequently mentioned, is that which was proposed by a Norwegian bishop to pope Gregory the ninth. I take the account given by Raynaldus, under the year 1241. "Quod ad archiepiscopum Nidrosiensem attinet, apostolicam sedem literis suis consuluerat, num cervisia ob aquæ penuriam in baptismo conferendo adhiberi posset, cui Gregorius eos qui cervisia abluti fuerant baptismum rite non suscepisse respondit: 'Cum, sicut ex tua relatione didicimus, nonnunquam propter aquæ penuriam infantes terræ tuæ contingat in cervisia baptizari, tibi tenore præsentium respondemus, quod cum secundum doctrinam evangelicam oporteat ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto renasci, non debent reputari rite baptizati, qui in cervisia baptizantur.'"<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Bibl. Patrum. tom. II. p. 1132.

<sup>13</sup> Annal. ad an. 1241. n. xlij.

There are replies to similar questions, attributed to Siricius, in the fourth, and to Stephen 2nd. in the eighth century, which give a different conclusion. I quote the last of these. "Si in vino quis, propterea quod aquam non

inveniebat, omnino periclitantem infantem baptizavit, nulla ei inde ascribitur culpa. Infantes sic permaneant in eo baptismo. Nam si aqua adfuit præsens, ille presbyter excommunicetur, et pœnitentiæ submittatur; quia contra canonum sententiam agere præsumsit." Conc. Labb. tom. vj. p. 1652. With regard to both these replies,

The decree of the council of Trent upon the question, is said to have been directed against a heresy then spreading widely, amongst the followers of Luther and Calvin, which interpreted in a metaphorical sense only, the words of our Lord, "Except a man be born again of water, *etc.*"<sup>14</sup> The canon is; "*Si quis dixerit, aquam veram et naturalem non esse de necessitate baptismi, atque ideo verba illa Domini nostri Jesu Christi, Nisi quis renatus fuit ex aqua, et Spiritu Sancto, ad metaphoram aliquam detorserit; anathema sit.*" But whether this be so, or not, passages have been produced by Bellarmin, Tournely, Trombellius, and others, which shew that, in cases of necessity, the foreign reformers did not hesitate to extend, according to their own fancies, the conditions within which our Blessed Lord had limited the due administration of this sacrament. Let us take one or two of these.

Bellarmin says of Luther: "Interrogatus, num deficiente aqua, liceat baptizare in lacte, aut cerevisia, primum respondit; judicio divino id esse committendum; deinde addidit, quidquid balnei nomine nuncupari potest, illud esse aptum ad baptizandum. At certe balnea vini, et lactis, nedum cerevisiæ fieri posse, nemo dubitavit unquam."<sup>15</sup>

---

it is not unimportant to quote the remark of Tournely. "Si vera et genuina essent illa Siricii et Stephani decreta, vim et auctoritatem non habere, quæ nusquam ab ecclesia probata et recepta fuere; unde rei catholicæ nullum

damnum ac periculum accederet." p. 38. He proceeds to argue against their genuineness.

<sup>14</sup> Palavicinus. *Hist. Conc. Trident. lib. ix. cap. vij.*

<sup>15</sup> *In colloq. cap. 17. cit. Bellarm. de bapt. lib. 1. cap. 2.*

Beza wrote ; “Hæc mens fuit Christi, cum panem ac vinum ad hæc mysteria deligeret, ut propositis earum rerum signis, quibus corpus nostrum alitur, veram alimoniam spiritualem, velut ob oculos, repræsentaret. Itaque à Christi sententia nihil aberrat, qui nullo prorsus novandi studio, pro pane, et vino substituat, quæ etsi non parem, similem tamen alimoniam analogiam habeant. Desit etiam aqua, et tamen baptismus alicujus differri cum ædificatione non possit, nec debeat : ego certe quovis alio liquore, non minus rite quam aqua baptizaverim. Nec aliter de his rebus ipsi etiam superstitiosissimi scholastici scriptores censuerunt.”<sup>16</sup> After reading this, and the unblushing assertion at the end of it, we may very well agree with Vossius, who remarks : “Ubi quod idem sentire dicit scholasticos, metuo, ne eum memoria fefellit.”<sup>17</sup> Others have not hesitated directly to accuse Bucer of stating what he knew to be false.

Some similar unjustifiable alterations, though not to any great extent, and based on very different grounds, had been condemned many ages previously by the Anglo-saxon church. A practice seems to have been

---

<sup>16</sup> Ad Tillium. epist. *Tract. Theolog. tom. III.*

Other foreign protestants also : “Materia baptismi externa et sensibilis est aqua ; aut, ea deficiente, alius liquor analogicus.” Polanus, *Sylloge Thes. pars. 2. p. 556.* “Ubi aqua nulla haberi potest,

alium aliquem liquorem eundem cum aqua usum habentem, et aquæ maxime analogum substitui posse non plane negamus.” Festus Homius, *in disp. 45.* Compare Vorstius in *Antibellarm. p. 367 :* and Rivettus, *tr. 3. §. iij. p. 705.*

<sup>17</sup> De baptismo. *disp. 1. p. 30.*



creeping in, of mixing wine with the water in baptism. Egbert, archbishop of York, forbids this in his excerp-tions. “Sunt quidam qui miscent vinum cum aqua baptismatis non recte ; et Christus non jussit baptizari vino, sed aqua.”<sup>18</sup>

As I have already observed, the many texts of Scripture which speak of water, and of water only, as the proper *matter* of the sacrament of baptism, are so clear, that we can but wonder how any disputes about it could have arisen. Nor shall I be required to delay upon the consideration of it. In addition to the places in the New Testament which have been before cited, the reader will also remember the example of S. Philip and the Ethiopian eunuch: “And as they went on their way, they came unto a certain water ; and the eunuch said, See, here is water ; what doth hinder me to be baptized?—and they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch ; and he baptized him.” Again, S. Peter, speaking of Cornelius and his company, inquires : “Can any man forbid water, that these should not be baptized?” And, once more, the same apostle in his first epistle ; “—in the days of Noah,—eight souls were saved by water ; the like figure whereunto, even baptism, doth also now save us.”<sup>19</sup>

Nor should I omit that place in the prophet Ezekiel,

<sup>18</sup> Excerpt. xlij. Thorpe, Ancient laws and institutes. vol. 2. p. 103.

<sup>19</sup> Acts. ch. viij. v. 36. Ch. x. v. 46. S. Peter. epist. 1. ch. iij. v. 20.

in which the best commentators interpret him to be alluding to the future sacrament of baptism: an interpretation supported (it must be also remarked) by those who prepared the short summaries prefixed to the chapters of the Bible, in our present version; "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you, and ye shall be clean."<sup>20</sup> And, once more; the apostle, probably referring to this very passage, says, in his epistle to the Hebrews; "Let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith, having our hearts sprinkled from an evil conscience, and our bodies washed with pure water."<sup>21</sup>

Regarding a thing so repeated and well known as the opinion is, upon this question, of the Fathers, it is

<sup>20</sup> *Ch.* xxxvj. v. 25.

Archbishop Peckham was the compiler of a work, useful both in its design and execution, in which he reduced under their proper theological divisions, numerous texts of Holy Scripture, bearing upon the great doctrines of the Christian faith. This book still exists probably in manuscript in many libraries; and it was more than once printed: although copies are scarce. The title is: "Collectaneum bibliorum quinque libris sententias divinæ scripturæ ad certos titulos, seu locos communes redigens. Autore Johanne Pechano Cantuariensis ecclesiæ archipræsule."

Upon the doctrine of baptism, *lib.* iv. the archbishop refers to this text in Ezechiel, and, besides others, to the following: "Fons egredietur de domo Domini, et irrigabit torrentem spinarum." *Joel.* iij. "Erit fons patens domui David, et habitantibus Hierusalem in ablutionem peccatoris et menstruatae." *Zach.* xij.—Upon some texts the archbishop inserts a gloss: as, for example, still upon baptism: "Exibunt aquæ vivæ de Hierusalem (ecclesia) medium earum ad mare orientale (originale) et medium earum ad mare novissimum (attuale)." *Zach.* xiv.

<sup>21</sup> *Ch.* x. v. 22.

quite unnecessary to do more, than submit to the reader two or three quotations. The Apostolical constitutions, in the chapter, “concerning the divine initiation of holy baptism,” directs: “Deinde, aut tu, episcopo, aut tibi subjectus presbyter, sacram super eos proferens nominatim invocationem Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, baptizabis eos in aqua.”<sup>22</sup> S. Justin, in his first apology, after briefly mentioning the previous prayers and fasting of the catechumens, proceeds: “Deinde eo ducuntur a nobis, ubi aqua est, et eodem regenerationis modo regenerantur, quo et ipsi sumus regenerati. Nam in nomine parentis universorum ac Domini Dei ac Salvatoris nostri Jesu Christi et Spiritus Sancti lavacrum in aqua tunc suscipiunt. Dixit enim Christus, *Nisi regenerati fueritis, etc.*”<sup>23</sup> Tertullian begins his treatise on baptism in these words; “Felix sacramentum aquæ nostræ, qua abluti delictis pristinæ cæcitatibus, in vitam æternam liberamur!”<sup>24</sup> Shortly afterwards in the same treatise, he declares; “Omnes aquæ de pristina originis prærogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim statim Spiritus de cœlis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso, et ita

---

<sup>22</sup> *Lib. III. cap. xvj.*

<sup>23</sup> *Apol. I. §. 61. Opera, p. 71.*

<sup>24</sup> *Opera, p. 224.* The note given upon the words, *sacramentum aquæ*, is: “Vides vocem hæreticis nostris odiosam, in ve-

tustissimo scriptore. Aquæ etiam fit mentio, et inde colliges aquæ necessitatem in baptismo contra Calvinum assecutas.” I do not remember that the term “sacramentum” as applied to baptism, occurs in any earlier writer.

sanctificatæ, vim sanctificandi combibunt.” S. Cyprian cites the prophecy of Ezechiel already spoken of, and concludes; “Oportet mundari et sanctificari aquam prius a sacerdote, *etc.*” Nor in another place does he hesitate to say: “quotiescunque autem aqua sola in scripturis sanctis nominatur, baptismus prædicatur.”<sup>25</sup> S. Augustin asks: “Quid est baptismus Christi? Lavacrum aquæ in verbo. Tolle aquam, non est baptismus: tolle verbum, non est baptismus.”<sup>26</sup> Lastly, take two places from S. Ambrose, whose works abound with references to this fact: speaking of baptism, in his work *de mysteriis*, he inquires: “Quid vidisti? aquas utique, sed non solas: levitas illic ministrantes, summum sacerdotem interrogantem et consecrantem.” Again, in his book *de Spiritu Sancto*, the sixth chapter: “Sunt tamen plerique qui eo quod in aqua baptizamur et Spiritu, non putent aquæ et Spiritus distare munera; et ideo non putant distare naturam. Nec advertunt quia in illo aquarum sepelimur elemento, ut renovati per Spiritum resurgamus.”<sup>27</sup>

With regard also to the consent of rituals upon the same question, I think it may be safely asserted, that it is impossible to produce any Order of Baptism, according to the Use of any Church, whether of the East or West, at any time from the earliest ages, of which the records remain, down to the present, by which any

---

<sup>25</sup> *Epist.* lxx. *Opera.* p. 125. *tom.* III. 2. p. 408.  
*epist.* lxij. p. 106.

<sup>26</sup> In Joan. Tr. xv. §. 4. *Opera.* <sup>27</sup> *Opera.* *tom.* II. p. 328. 616.

other element than water, and water only, is appointed or allowed, in which the sacrament of baptism might lawfully be administered.

Nor are the decisions of the canon-law, and of canonists, less certain and direct. In the 3rd book of the Decretals we have this rescript. “*Postulasti, utrum parvuli sint pro Christianis habendi, quos in articulo mortis constitutos propter aquæ penuriam, et absentiam sacerdotis, aliquorum simplicitas in caput ac pectus ac inter scapulas pro baptismo salivæ conspersione linivit. Respondemus, quod cum in baptismo duo semper, videlicet verbum et elementum, necessario requirantur, juxta quod de verbo Veritas ait: ‘Euntes in mundum, etc.’ eademque dicat de elemento: ‘Nisi quis renatus, etc.’ dubitare non debes illos verum non habere baptismum, in quibus non solum utrumque prædictorum, sed eorum alterum est omissum.*”<sup>28</sup> And again, the Decretum, citing the well known dictum of S. Augustin; “*Detrahe verbum, et quid est aqua, nisi aqua? accedit verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum.*”<sup>29</sup>

Not to cite more, it will suffice to add the testimony of canonists received in England. Hostiensis, speaking of baptism, says: “*Ad ejus formam seu essentiam duo necessaria sunt, verbum et elementum;—elementum, id est, aqua necessaria est.*”<sup>30</sup> Lyndwood also: “*Duo sunt necessaria, sc. verbum, et elementum aquæ.*”<sup>31</sup>

<sup>28</sup> Decretal. *lib. 3. tit. xlij. cap. v.*

<sup>29</sup> Decret. *Caus. 1. Quæst. 1. liv.*

<sup>30</sup> Summa. *lib. 3. rubr. xlij.*

<sup>31</sup> *Lib. 1. tit. 7. Quod in constitutione. verb. legitime factum.*



Again, the *Pupilla oculi*. “*Ablutio sive tinctio in aqua naturali est materiale in baptismo.*”<sup>32</sup> These, let me remark, are but echoes and explanations of the declaratory acts of English diocesan and provincial councils, to the same effect. Take, for example, this from the synod of Exeter, in 1287; “*Duo sunt necessaria in baptismo; sc. verbum et elementum, utroque vel altero deficiente, nihil est quod agitur.*”<sup>33</sup>

Lastly, the authority of our Book of Common Prayer. In the catechism it is asked: “What is the outward visible sign in baptism? Water: wherein the person is baptized.” And with this we must compare the question put in cases where children have been baptized in houses: “Because some things essential to this sacrament may happen to be omitted through fear or haste, in such times of extremity; therefore I demand further of you, With what matter was this child baptized?” The rubric at the commencement of the Office having previously enjoined “Water” to be poured upon the child.

And, as water is the proper and only “*materia remota*” of the sacrament of baptism, so is it required also that it should be pure and natural. Of these two requisites, the last may be held to be necessary, the other to be of the very highest importance. For it seems to be agreed upon that, when necessity so compels, accidents, such as purity or moderate impurity,

---

<sup>32</sup> *Pars. 2. cap. iv.* So, the  
*Parochiale curatorum, fol. cvj. b.*

<sup>33</sup> Wilkins. *Concilia. tom. 2.*  
*p. 131.*

saltiness or freshness, warmth or cold, do not militate against the validity of the sacrament conferred with it: but otherwise, in cases where liquids distilled by some chemical process from flowers, *etc.* have been proposed to be used.

Upon this subject,—one which I do not desire to enter into at any length, yet which must not be passed over as undeserving altogether our careful consideration,—I shall submit to the reader a passage from the *Summa Theologica* of Antoninus, in which that author has collected the various opinions and decisions of the earlier schoolmen. “*Materia baptismi remota est aqua elementalis, puta naturalis; et hoc, sive sit terrestris, ut maris, stagni, fluminis, vel fontis; sive cœlestis, ut pluvialis, sive resoluta ex nivibus, glacie, rore, pruina, vel grandine; quæ omnes sunt veræ aquæ. Similiter de aqua sulphurea, vel lixivio.*”<sup>34</sup> *Dixit Petrus*

<sup>34</sup> This appears to have been a difficulty upon which many of the schoolmen and canonists seem to have hesitated. Aquinas says: “*Ad quartum dicendum, quod in lixivio et in aquis sulphureorum balneorum potest fieri baptismus: quia tales aquæ non incorporantur per artem, vel naturam aliquibus corporibus mixtis, sed solum alterationem quandam recipiunt ex hoc, quod transeunt per aliqua corpora.*” Again, below the text, in answer to the objection, “*Lixivium non videtur aqua pura.*” it is replied: “*Negatur, loquendo de puritate ab hoc articulo princi-*

*paliter intenta.* §. *Lixivium enim non amisit speciem aquæ ex eo, quod per cineres transivit. Iste enim transitus non sufficit ad solvendum speciem aquæ: licet suffecerit ad alterandum aquam, etiam quoad proprietates ejus, ut exemplificat argumentum.*” *Summa. Pars. III. Quæst. 66. Art. iv.*

Duns Scotus also: “*De quibusdam autem aquis dubium est si conservent, et retineant suam speciem, ut in lixivio, et in cerevisia.*” *Reportat. lib. iv. dist. iij. quæst. 3.*

de Palude, quod aquæ, quæ veniunt in usum nostrum, sunt ejusdem speciei cum elementalī, quæ non est susceptiva saporis, vel coloris. Sapores autem, quos circa nos habent aquæ nostræ, dulcis, amarus, sulphureus, et hujusmodi, non sunt in ipsa aqua; sed in aliquo vapore admisto subjective, qui realiter differt ab ea. De brodio autem, si est expressum ex carnibus, vel piscibus, non est vera aqua: et sic cum eo non potest baptizari. Si autem est aqua impinguata, sic potest fieri, quia est vera aqua: nisi sit nimis condensata. Aqua artificialis non est conveniens materia, quia non est ejusdem speciei cum naturali, sicut est aqua rosacea, aqua ardens, cerevisia. Urina autem, sudor, et saliva non est conveniens materia.<sup>35</sup> Et quia de substantia materiæ est, quod sit aqua, quæ possit abluere, immergere, vel aspergere; hinc est, quod glacies, quamvis maneat infra speciem aquæ, durante tali dispositione, non videtur conveniens materia. Fons autem baptisterii, licet in hyeme, dum est congelatus, non possit inde baptizari, nisi igne dissolvatur; liquefactus tamen non oportet, quod iterum benedicatur.<sup>36</sup> Hæc omnia idem Petrus. De aqua permixta dicit Thomas in. 3. part. quæst. 66. art. 4. quod quando est talis permistio,

---

<sup>35</sup> "Parvuli, quos in articulo mortis constitutos, propter aquæ penuriam, et absentiam sacerdotis, aliquorum simplicitas in caput et pectus, ac inter scapulas, pro baptismo, salivæ conspersione linivit, verum non habent baptismum." *Decr. cit. p. 44.*

<sup>36</sup> This sentence, with another below, has reference to those Churches, according to whose rituals the water is reserved for certain periods, whether longer or shorter, in the font. I shall have to observe again, in a succeeding chapter, upon this custom.

quod tollat speciem, sicut cum per putrefactionem, vel digestionem transit in vinum, aut per additionem alterius liquoris in tanta quantitate, quod solvat speciem, sicut parum aquæ multo vino admistum; tunc de ea non potest fieri baptismus. Sed quando est talis alteratio, vel permistio, quod non solvit speciem, sicut cum calefit, vel quum aliquid solidum ponitur in aqua, quod non commiscetur, vel si aliquis liquor commisceatur, tamen in parva quantitate, ut parum vini in multa aqua; sic potest ibi fieri baptismus. Idem Albertus, qui etiam dicit, quod melius est, quod faciat calefacere aquam tempore hyemali, quia frigida posset nocere parvulo, et cum illa aqua calefacta potest commiscere partem de aqua consecrata. De aqua, quam faciunt alchemistæ ad mutandum metalla, non potest fieri baptismus, quia mutatur species aquæ.”<sup>37</sup>

To the same purpose, and in the words of preceding canonists, we find it laid down by Lyndwood: “Ex parte elementi requiritur aqua naturalis. Unde in saliva, vel in vino, aut alio liquore non tenet baptismus. Et idem, secundum *Hosti.*<sup>38</sup> si liquor alius aquæ sit admixtus, prout ipse *Hosti.* notat. Aliqui tamen distinguunt, an major pars sit de aqua, ut tunc sit baptizatus: secus, si minor pars sit de aqua. *Sanctus Tho.* dicit, quod si ex mixtura desinit species aquæ, tunc in

<sup>37</sup> Summa. par. III. tit. xiv. cap. 13. cit. Trombelli, de sacram. Tom. 4. p. 322. As to chemical and distilled waters, see the argu-

ment in Scotus, in the place cited above.

<sup>38</sup> Hostiensis, in summa. lib. 3. rubr. xlij. §. Quæ sit ejus forma.

tali liquore factus baptismus non tenet. Unde in aqua maris, item lixivio, et in aquis sulphureis, et in aliis aquis, quæ ex terra, per quam transeunt, immutantur, potest fieri baptismus: non tamen in aqua quæ ratione luti admixti desinit habere puritatem suam." He proceeds to some other details, already mentioned above: and continues: "Ego vero, si puerum in tali aqua permixta contingeret forsân baptizari, consulerem, ut rebaptizaretur, sicut fieret, ubi dubium est de baptismo; viz. hoc modo. *Si es baptizatus, ego te non rebaptizo: sed si nondum es baptizatus, ego baptizo, etc.*"<sup>39</sup>

<sup>39</sup> *Lib. 1. tit. 7.* Quod in constitutione. *verb.* legitime factum.

I would place here an extract from the *Pupilla oculi*. "Ablutio sive tinctio in aqua naturali est materiale in baptismo: pro quo notandum, quod aqua naturalis sola, et nullus alius liquor est materia conveniens baptismo: et hoc ideo, quia sic institutum est a Christo. *Johan. 3.* Nam aquæ artificiales sunt corpora quædam mixta; et non dicuntur aquæ nisi æquivoce. Sicut declarat Scotus super *iiij. di. iij. q. iij.* diffuse.—Oportet igitur ad esse baptismi, quod fiat in aqua usuali, apta ad abluendum: *etc.*" *Pars. 2. cap. iv.*

To the same effect is the chapter on this subject in the *Manipulus Curatorum*: which I do not therefore extract. But at the end of it a case is put, which will serve to shew the student the

curious details into which the inquiries of mediæval canonists and schoolmen reached: for it occurs not only in this English book, but in many foreign works of the same class. "Si esset unus puer baptizandus, juxta unum puteum profundum, et ille qui debet eum baptizare, non haberet cum quo traheret aquam de puteo, nec posset aliunde aquam habere, et puer esset in periculo mortis, nunquid deberet eum in puteum projicere, dicendo, *baptizo te, etc.*? Dicendum est, quod non: quia secundum quod dicit B. Paulus; 'Non sunt facienda mala ut inde eveniant bona.' Licet ergo ex hoc istud bonum eveniret, quod anima illius pueri salvaretur, tamen ille qui projiceret eum faceret istud malum quod peccaret mortaliter: et sic quantum in se esset damnaret animam suam: et qui-



Upon this whole question we may conclude, that Water being, as it undeniably is, the proper Matter of the sacrament of baptism, all possible care is to be taken, that clean, pure, and natural water only be prepared: that in cases of necessity, varying according to the variety of the case, water though it be mixed with other substances still may be admitted; provided always that the element of natural water be in the greatest proportion: that in cases where, through extreme need, liquids have been taken, concerning which, upon subsequent inquiry, doubts exist as to their having been justly within the allowed limits, then that the hypothetical form of baptism, as in all other doubtful cases, should be used: and, lastly, that no baptism can be counted valid, which has been administered with any liquid, of which pure and natural water does not form a part.

Many of the difficulties which have been proposed upon this point, indeed several of those specified in the extracts given above, may seem of very unlikely, even if not of impossible, occurrence. But, with one or two exceptions, it is probable that they all sprung from actual experience. In these times, and in our own Church, we, who are accustomed to the careful prepa-

---

libet secundum exordium charitatis plus debet diligere animam suam quam animam cujuscunque alterius." *Fol. vij. a. cap. 2.*

Compare also, the "Parochiale curatorum," *tit. ix. cap. 1.* And

if one is desirous to examine the question at length, Liberius. *Opera. tom. 3. p. 267.* Billuart. *Summa theol. tom. viij. p. 394.* Cf. Martene. *Vet. Script. tom. 9. p. 390.*

ration beforehand of every thing required for the due administration of this holy sacrament,<sup>40</sup> scarcely contemplate any difficulty whatever respecting, at least, the element to be used. However, history and historical documents, the canons of councils, and replies of bishops, and decisions of canonists, all testify that difficulties and doubts may arise. Nor will it have been, I trust, without some practical benefit, that I have ventured to direct the attention of our clergy once more to this, as well as to some other particulars, which have been of late, it may be, generally disregarded.<sup>41</sup>

It is not well that we should inquire too narrowly into the reasons why the element of water was chosen by our Blessed Lord, as that with which baptism was to be administered. Even if we could perceive no reasons, it would be sufficient for us to know, that He has

---

<sup>40</sup> In saying this, I am bound to protest against the neglect, which in some parishes is suffered, of not using, according to the strict injunctions of the Church, a decent Font. As year after year goes by, there is a rapid improvement in all parts of the country in this respect: nevertheless, there are churches in which the parish priests still use some small sort of bason, barely large enough to dip the hand in. This does not admit of an excuse (remembering how stringent the ecclesiastical law is, as to the necessary furni-

ture of churches) even in those places where there happens to be no font belonging to the church: —(see the 81st canon of 1603)—but it is a negligence the most scandalous where there is one.

<sup>41</sup> Still more may such inquiries and learning probably be followed by beneficial results, now that our Church is extending so widely and energetically her missionary labours. For it is among heathen people, and in wild and distant lands, that cases of sudden difficulty or emergency may be supposed likely to happen.

appointed it, who is supreme. But, besides this, water commends itself at once to ourselves also, being in its nature apt and suitable for the object proposed, and of all things the most readily at hand, under every circumstance in which men can be placed.

And the fathers, in many places, give various reasons. A common one is, that, as we are born again in baptism, so we are baptized in water, as the first spring and original of the created things of the earth. Thus S. Cyril of Jerusalem in answer to this very question, says: “Magnum quiddam est aqua, et ex quatuor conspicuis mundi elementis pulcherrimum. Angelorum habitatio cœlum est; atqui ex aquis sunt cœli: terra hominum sedes est; atqui ex aquis etiam terra. Et ante omnem creaturarum rerum formationem sex diebus elaboratam, *Spiritus Dei ferebatur super aquam*.—Ubicunque fœdus cum aliquibus intercedit, ibi aqua. Fœdus cum Noe sancitum est, post diluvium.—Elias assumitur, sed non sine aqua: prius enim trajicit Jordanem, deinde cœlum curru ab equis subvectus permeat: *etc.*”<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>42</sup> The note upon this place of S. Cyril, by his Benedictine editors, deserves extracting. “Quas ad hujus quæstionis solutionem Cyrillus adfert rationes, in veterum scriptis communes sunt.—Cœlum et terram ex aquis orta ait Cyrillus. Quod de terra docet, sumtum videtur ex his verbis S. Petri. 2. epist. iij. v. 5. *Και γη ἐξ ὕδατος, καὶ δι’ ὕδατος συνε-*

*στώσα*. Quod cum Petrus dixisse tantum videatur de terra, cum sub aquis delitesceret, Dei jussu emergente; Cyrillus de ipsa terræ ex aqua constitutione intellixisse judicatur, ex his quæ habet *Cat.* 9. n. 9. et *Cat.* 16. n. 12. Cœlos autem non ex aquis solummodo fabricatos, sed aqueæ etiam esse naturæ docet Cyrillus *Cat.* 9. n. 5.” *Opera.* p. 41. *Catech.* III.

Tertullian also, in his treatise *de baptismo* uses a like train of reasoning, arguing (it must be remembered) against the heresy of those who rejected water in this sacrament: and he continues: “si exinde universa vel plura prosequar, quæ de elementi istius auctoritate commemorem, quanta vis ejus aut gratia, quot ingenia, quot officia, quantum instrumentum mundo ferat, verrear ne laudes aquæ potius quam baptismi rationes videar congregasse, licet eo plenius docere non esse dubitandum, si materiam, quam in omnibus rebus et operibus suis Deus disposuit, etiam in sacramentis propriis parere fecit: si quæ vitam terrenam gubernat, et in cœlesti procurat.”<sup>43</sup>

Again, S. Ambrose, if we allow the commentary upon the epistle to the Romans, which is attributed to him, to be genuine: “Baptisma—per aquam celebratur, ut sicut aqua sordes corporis abluit, ita et nos per baptismum ab omni peccato spiritualiter purgatos nos et innovatos credamus.”<sup>44</sup> S. Jerome argues in the

de baptismo. Compare S. Aug. Opera. tom. 5. col. 41. §. 2.

Upon all this, I must not omit to refer the reader to S. Justin, Opera, p. 9. (Ad Græcos cohortatio. §. 3.) and to S. Irenæus, Opera. p. 133. (Contra hæres. cap. xiv.) where those fathers reject this opinion; tracing it through the earlier Gentile poets and philosophers.

<sup>43</sup> Cap. iij. Opera. p. 225. cf. cap. v. ix.

<sup>44</sup> Opera. tom. 2. App. p. 59.

Compare the passage in the same father's exposition of the gospel of S. Luke. “De aqua quid loquar? super aquam ante ipsos mundi natales Sanctus, ut legitur, Spiritus ferebatur. O aqua, quæ humano adpersum sanguine, ut præsentium lavacrorum figura præcederet, orbem terrarum lavisti! O aqua, quæ sacramentum Christi esse meruisti, quæ lavas omnia, nec lavaris! Tu incipis

same way in his epistle to Oceanus; <sup>45</sup> and S. Anselm also declares: “sicut aqua extinguit ignem elementarem, ita baptismus extinguit ignem gehennæ.” <sup>46</sup>

prima, tu complex perfecta mysteria. A te principium, in te finis: vel potius tu facis ut finem nesciamus.—Te prophético percussa tactu, ut sitientium rigares corda populorum, vomuit petra: te, cùm de latere Salvatoris erumperes, percussores viderunt, et crediderunt: et ideo regenerationis nostræ de tribus una es testibus; tres enim testes sunt, aqua,

sanguis, et spiritus. Aqua ad lavacrum, sanguis ad pretium, spiritus ad resurrectionem.” Opera. tom. 1. p. 1514.

<sup>45</sup> Opera. tom. 1. p. 419. *Edit.* Venet. 1766. 4to.

<sup>46</sup> *Cit.* Tournely de bapt. p. 29. John Gerson states six reasons: *de vij. Sacram.* Opera. tom. 1. p. 262.



## CHAPTER III.

**H**AVING thus, according to the common theological division, spoken of the *Materia remota*, I shall proceed in this chapter to the consideration of the *Materia proxima*; which, in the sacrament of baptism, is Ablution, in some way or other to be performed. And it is quite clear at once, that ablution may be, either by immersing the person to be baptized, or by sprinkling, or by pouring water over him.

It seems to be allowed upon all hands that in the earliest ages of the Church, the rule, except in cases of emergency, was to confer baptism by immersion.<sup>1</sup> Being so, it can be referred only to the constant practice observed by the apostles. John the baptist is said by the evangelist to have been “baptizing in Ænon near to Salim, because there was much water

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Tournely. *p.* 40. Trombelli, *de sacram. tom. 5. dissert.* xj. Bingham. *Christ. Ant. Book* xj. *c.* xi. §. 4. Vicecomes, *de ant. bapt. rit. lib. 4. cap. vj.* Calvör. *Rit. Eccles. p.* 257.

The only place which throws any doubt upon the universality of the practice, is where Lactantius

writes that our Lord was baptized in Jordan, “*ut etiam gentes baptismo, id est, purifici roris perfusione salvaret.*” *Lib. iv. cap. 15.* But Le Nourry has shewn that nothing is to be concluded from the use of the word *perfusio* in this passage. *Apparatus ad bibl. max. tom. 2. p.* 923.

there." It is recorded of our Blessed Lord also, that He, "when He was baptized, went up straightway out of the water." Once more, it is written of Philip the deacon, and the Ethiopian eunuch: "they went down both into the water, both Philip and the eunuch; and he baptized him."<sup>2</sup> The conclusion to be drawn from these statements is sufficiently plain. Bingham justly observes, that S. Paul evidently alludes to this custom in many places of his epistles; for example: "We are buried with Him by baptism: that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life." And, in another epistle: "Buried with Him in baptism, wherein ye are also risen with Him, through the faith of the operation of God, Who raised Him from the dead."<sup>3</sup>

I shall take two testimonies from the fathers. Tertullian writes: "Ut a baptisinate ingrediar, aquam adituri, ibidem, sed et aliquanto prius in ecclesia sub antistitis manu contestamur nos renuntiare diabolo, et pompæ et angelis ejus; dehinc ter mergitamur, amplius aliquid respondententes, quam Dominus in evangelio determinavit."<sup>4</sup> And the often quoted passage in the treatise of S. Ambrose upon the sacraments. 'Interrogatus es: credis in Deum Patrem omnipo-

---

<sup>2</sup> S. John. *Ch.* iij. v. 23. S. Matt. *Ch.* iij. v. 16. Acts, *ch.* viij. v. 38. est:" says S. Ambrose, de Sacram. *lib.* 2. *cap.* vj.

<sup>3</sup> Rom. *ch.* vj. v. 4. Coloss. *ch.* ij. v. 12. "Fons quasi sepultura" <sup>4</sup> De corona. *cap.* 3. cf. adv. Praxeas. *cap.* 26.

tentem? dixisti, credo, et mersisti, hoc est, sepultus es. Iterum interrogatus es: credis in Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum, et in crucem ejus? dixisti, credo, et mersisti; ideo et Christo es consepultus: qui enim Christo consepelitur, cum Christo resurgit. Tertio interrogatus es: credis et in Spiritum Sanctum? dixisti, credo, tertio mersisti; ut multiplicem lapsum superioris ætatis absolveret trina confessio." In the same work, S. Ambrose says in the chapter preceding: "Nunc disputemus quid sit quod dicitur baptisma? Venisti ad fontem, descendisti in eum, etc." Once more; "Hoc est vita corporis vivens, cum veniret ad fontem, et mergeretur in fontem."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup> Opera. tom. 2. p. 360. Compare also, cited by most writers upon this subject, S. Justin, opera, p. 93. S. Cyril, catech. 2. p. 251. S. Chrysostom, hom. 6. in Epist. ad Coloss. S. Basil, de Spiritu S. cap. 27. Gregor. Nyssen, orat. catech. cap. 35. and the very ancient author under the name of Dionysius Areopagit. de eccles. hierarch. cap. 2. §. vij.

S. Ambrose in the text, and many of the fathers, allude to the descent into the font. "Descendisti in eum." Compare Tertullian: de bapt. cap. xx. The early ritualists frequently speak of this; and that the descent was by a fixed number of steps. This was quite in accordance with the widespread and reverential feelings

which, in those ages, led men to symbolize, and gladly to find symbols in, the sacred rites and ceremonies of the Catholic faith. Thus, Isidore Hispalensis; "Fons autem origo omnium gloriarum est, cujus septem gradus sunt, tres in descensu, propter tria quibus renunciamus: tres in ascensu, propter tria, quæ confitemur: septimus vero is est, qui et quartus, similis filio hominis, extinguens fornacem ignis, stabilimentum pedum, etc." De ecc. off. lib. 2. cap. xxiv. Auct. bibl. patr. tom. 1. p. 223. So also, Alcuin, cap. de Sabbato s. pasch. Ibid. p. 258. Others make the seven steps to signify the seven-fold gifts of the Holy Spirit.

These passages from Tertullian and S. Ambrose bring to our notice the fact also, no less acknowledged, that the general practice of the Church antiently was, to administer baptism with the rite of trine immersion. Bingham may easily be referred to for various other authorities upon this point, to which I shall only add the 50th of the so-called Apostolical canons: "If any bishop or presbyter does not perform the one initiation with three immersions, but with giving one immersion only, into the death of the Lord, let him be deposed. For the Lord said not; Baptize into my death; but, Go—baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And this, from S. Gregory of Nyssa: "We immerse *to the Father* that we may be sanctified; we immerse *to the Son* also to this same end; we immerse also *to the Holy Ghost*, that we may be that which He is and is called. There is no difference in the sanctification."<sup>6</sup>

Hence, the constant custom of the church being so undeniable in respect of these observances, it occurs to us immediately to inquire, whether that can be admitted to be a valid baptism which has not been administered by immersion, three times; the immersion repeated at the pronunciation of the name of each Person in the Undivided Trinity? Upon this the testimony of the greatest fathers is unanimous and sufficient, that it is valid: and that the rite of trine im-

---

<sup>6</sup> In bapt. Christi. tom. 3. p. 372.

mersion does not rest upon any higher authority, high as that confessedly is, than the example and precept of the Church. An authority great enough to demand obedience at all times when justly exercised, but nevertheless not sufficient to add restrictions and conditions beyond or besides those, within which the Author of the sacraments has promised to convey His saving grace. The command of our Blessed Lord to His disciples was, that they should baptize: but we do not read in the Scriptures any injunction that it should be by immersion only, though unquestionably there are many allusions to that practice, as the apostolic one; much less do we read that it should be repeated three times.

Rather, on the contrary, may plain notices be found in the Scriptures, shewing that, in cases of necessity, baptism was administered by sprinkling or affusion. As upon that occasion when, after the discourse of S. Peter, “they that gladly received his word were baptized: and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls.” Or, again, the instance of the jailor at Philippi; who “the same hour of the night,—was baptized, he and all his, straightway.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> Acts. *ch.* ij. *v.* 41. *Ch.* xvj. *v.* 33.

Compare the account (in the annals) of the many thousands baptized in one day in Lithuania: which was effected, if the relation be true, (which I am disposed to

doubt,) in a manner more than once condemned by the judgment of the catholic church: namely by aspersion over numbers at one time; as anciently in the church of England, when the use of holy-water was still retained, and now



The reason, already mentioned, that water may, possibly, have been appointed by our Lord, as the matter of this sacrament, on account of its being under almost all circumstances easily to be procured, is not without its weight in the consideration of the necessity of trine immersion. Because there are many cases in

in the church of Rome. Raynald. *ad an.* 1387. *n.* xv.

Trombelli cites the following from the martyrologies. "In actis S. Laurentii, hæc extant. 'Porro extensus in catasta et scorpionibus gravissime cæsus est;—tunc unus ex militibus nomine Romanus credidit Domino Jesu Christo, et dixit beato Laurentio—adjuro te per Christum, qui tibi misit angelum suum, ne me derelinquas.—Veniens autem Romanus, afferens aquam misit se ad pedes beati Laurentii, ut baptizaretur, qui benedicta aqua baptizavit eum.' In actis S. Gratiliani hæc occurrunt. 'Rogavit eum [*Gratilianum*] S. Felicissima,—tunc dicit ei beatus Gratilianus, ego quidem ostendo tibi, soror mea, viam Christi. Et tunc obtulit ei beata Felicissima urceum cum aqua per illuminationem suam: et baptizavit eam astante matre sua. Et dicit ei beatus Gratilianus, Baptizo te, etc.'" *tom.* 5. *p.* 3. note.

With regard to the three thousand baptized after S. Peter's dis-

course, Arcudius appeals to it, against Hieremias, patriarch of Constantinople, who had argued for the absolute necessity of immersion, and insisted on an exact imitation of the circumstances of our Lord's baptism. "Doceat nos Hieremias, et probet, qua ratione apostoli per immersionem, et trinam immersionem uno die tria millia—potuerint baptizare? miror autem cur Hieremias non etiam flumen requirat, quandoquidem omnia fieri ad Christi Domini exigit normam:—tametsi per immersionem baptizatus est Christus, tamen ob aliam significationem, quæ minime nobis convenit. Ut enim Nazianzenus ait, ascendit Jesus de aqua, secum quodammodo demersum educens, et elevans mundum." *Concordia eccl.* lib. 1. cap. 10. He goes on to prove, that it is not certain that our Blessed Lord was in fact immersed in the river Jordan. On the probable practice of S. John, see also Scacchi, *Sacr. Elæochr. Myroth.* p. 149. On later Greek affusion, cf. Goar, *Rit.* p. 365.

which, (sometimes from one cause, sometimes from another) a sufficient quantity for that purpose cannot be obtained: or, if at hand, it might be impossible so to administer.

The case of clinic reception was one which early called for the deliberation of the rulers of the church:<sup>8</sup> not to insist upon other examples, let us take the famous one of Novatian, in the 3rd century. From the account which Eusebius gives, who has inserted in his history parts of the epistle of Cornelius to Fabian on the matter, Novatian had been baptized, when in danger of death, on his bed. And Cornelius himself has been supposed to have entertained doubts as to the

<sup>8</sup> "Sine dubio primam aspersionis baptismo ansam præbuit baptismus Κλινικων sive *Grabatoriorum*; hi enim gravi morbo decumbentes Christoque adjungi expetentes aspergebantur solummodo, neque enim aliter, commode fieri poterat salutari fonte." Calvör. *Rit. Eccles.* p. 258. The same author mentions, in his next section, four causes wherefore the practice of immersion was gradually discontinued in the West: 1. "*Teneritudo infantum*," which would, of course, be a consideration of much weight in northern countries, and the more so, as adult baptism became the exception rather than the rule. 2. "*Erubescencia*," especially in fe-

males, notwithstanding the great care taken to provide against unnecessary intrusion. [Upon the ancient practice in this respect, both as regarded men and women, see, amongst others, Vicecomes, *de ant. bapt. rit. lib.* 4. *cap.* x. *et seqq.* Trombelli, *de bapt. tom.* 2. *Quæst.* ii. *cap.* iij. §. 12. Bingham, *Book.* xi. *ch.* 11.] 3. *Natura*, as in the well known examples of Constantine Copronymus, and Wenceslaus. 4. "τον βαπτισμον και το βαπτιζεσθαι non semper notare *immersionem* sed *ablutionem in genere*:" and this, whether by immersion or by aspersion. This last reason has been already treated of.

validity of such a baptism, for, speaking of its having been received, he adds this expression: “*Si tamen hujuscemodi baptismum suscepisse dicendus est.*” But it is very observable that he immediately passes on to say that Novatian had not received confirmation, nor chrism.<sup>9</sup> In fact, it is well known that the Roman clergy did not require Novatian to be again baptized; their objections were directed against his having been admitted, under his peculiar circumstances, to holy orders.

But there is a most important epistle of S. Cyprian, also upon this subject, and in resolution of doubts which had been proposed to him regarding the same case. In that epistle, to Magnus, having discussed one matter, he proceeds: “*Quæsisisti, etiam, fili carissime, quid mihi de illis videatur qui infirmitate et languore gratiam Dei consequuntur, an habendi sint legitimi Christiani, eo quod aqua salutari non loti sint, sed perfusi.*” Now, from this question it is not, in the first place, quite clear that Magnus himself doubted of the substantial validity of such an administration of the sacrament, or that he doubted whether all the full

---

<sup>9</sup> *Eccles. Hist. lib. vj. cap. 43.* Valesius has a learned note upon this point, in which he considers it doubtful whether the words of Cornelius allude to the chrism, or only to the imposition of hands in confirmation. However, it seems certain that Novatian received neither: and the note itself con-

cludes: “*Porro ut ad Novatiani baptismum redeamus, hinc manasse mihi videtur mos Novatianorum, qui in baptismo sacrum chrisma non adhibebant teste Theodorito, in lib. 3. Hæret. fabularum; eo quod scilicet auctor ipsorum Novatianus baptismum sine chrismatione accepisset.*”

privileges of baptism were so conveyed, equally as by the observance of the general practice of immersion. And it is of no little importance that we should be certain, if possible, of the exact nature of the difficulties which Magnus entertained.

However the reply of S. Cyprian is conclusive, as to his own opinion. “*Nos æstimamus in nullo mutilari et debilitari posse beneficia divina, nec minus aliquid illic posse contingere, ubi plena et tota fide et dantis et sumentis accipitur quod de divinis numeribus hauritur. Neque enim sic in sacramento salutari delictorum contagia ut in lavacro carnali et sæculari sordes cutis et corporis abluuntur, ut aphronitis et cæteris quoque adjumentis et solio et piscina opus sit, quibus ablui et mundari corpusculum possit. Aliter pectus credentis abluitur, aliter mens hominis per fidei merita mundatur. In sacramentis salutaribus necessitate cogente, et Deo indulgentiam suam largiente, totum credentibus conferunt divina compendia. Nec quemquam movere debet quod aspergi vel perfundi videntur ægri cum gratiam dominicam consequuntur, quando scriptura sancta per Ezech. prophetam loquatur et dicat: Et aspergam, etc.*” The holy father cites some other texts, and continues: “*Unde apparet aspersionem quoque aquæ instar salutaris lavacri obtinere, et quando hæc in ecclesia fiunt, ubi sit et accipientis et dantis fides integra, stare omnia et consummari ac perfici posse majestate Domini et fidei veritate. Porro autem quod quidam eos salutari aqua et fide legitima Christi gratiam consecutos non christianos sed*

clnicos vocant, non invenio unde hoc nomen assumant.—Mea sententia hæc est; ut christianus iudicetur legitimus quisquis fuerit in ecclesia lege et jure fidei divinam gratiam consecutus. Aut si aliquis existimat eos nihil consecutos eò quod aqua salutari tantum perfusi sint, sed inanes et vacui sunt, non decipiantur, ut si incommodum languoris evaserint, et convaluerint, baptizentur. Si autem baptizari non possunt qui jam baptismo ecclesiastico sanctificati sunt, cur in fide sua et Domini indulgentia scandalizantur? An consecuti sunt quidem gratiam dominicam, sed breviori et minore mensura muneris divini ac Spiritus Sancti, ut habeantur quidem christiani, non sint tamen cæteris adæquandi? Quin immo Spiritus Sanctus non ad mensuram datur, sed super credentem totus infunditur.”<sup>10</sup>

Even though we allow that both Magnus and Cornelius entertained some doubts as to the validity of baptism by sprinkling or by affusion only, (a matter not, as it seems to me, by any means certain,) we cannot reasonably be astonished at it, if we remember how constantly, except in cases of extreme necessity, the practice of immersion had been observed, up to the age of the apostles. So constantly indeed, that as Vicecomes, a very learned writer on the antient rites and ceremonies of baptism, has observed, trine immersion, except in cases of necessity, has been made,

---

<sup>10</sup> Epist. lxxvi. Ad Magnum. *Opera*, p. 156.



by some, to rest even upon the authority and institution of our Blessed Lord.<sup>11</sup> But this is not according to the decisions of the Church herself, whenever the question has been brought forward for her authoritative judgement. And the difficulties which have been proposed with regard to baptism by sprinkling, or affusion, are probably to be traced to the fact, that such a mode was anciently adopted only in the case of those who were lying sick and dying upon their beds. Respecting the validity of whose baptism, the Church never doubted, as to either the manner of its being conferred, or the minister, (it might be, of lower rank than priest or bishop,) or because some of the usual solemnities of a public baptism had been omitted; but persons of that kind were looked upon, not unnaturally, with some suspicion as to the sincerity of their repentance and faith; and it was reasonably supposed that they had deferred the reception of the sacrament until driven to it, as it were, under the im-

---

<sup>11</sup> Vicecomes' assertion is : "Proferi et docere non desinam, sola in aquam mersione, si necessitatis usum excipias, in ecclesia baptizari licuisse. Nam divinarum literarum peritis dubium non est, Christum, cum apostolis præcepit, *Euntes*, etc, verbo *baptizantes* mersionem aquæ intellexisse. Quod quidem ex S. Chrysostomi auctoritate colligitur hom. de fide in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum S.—itemque ex illo Pelagii loco

apud Gratianum de consecrat. dist. 4. Uterque enim Christi præceptum de triplici mersione, quæ in baptismo fieri solet, videtur intellexisse: ut dubitandum nullo modo sit, quin ipsam quoque mersionem eodem præcepto contineri arbitrentur." *De ant. bapt. rit. ac cær.* p. 596. Vicecomes' argument from the word used by our Lord, does not rest on sufficient ground, even from the sense of his own extracts.

mediate fear and peril of death. For this cause therefore was it, and for this cause only, that strict prohibitions generally, and always many obstacles, were placed in the way of admitting such persons into offices of dignity or trust in the Church afterwards; for example, into holy orders.

A canon, the twelfth, of the council of Neo-cæsarea early in the fourth century, is much to the point: inasmuch as it expresses the prohibition, with the reason of it; and states also the grounds on which it might nevertheless be relaxed: in neither case throwing any doubt upon the validity of the baptism. “Si quis ægrotans fuerit illuminatus, non potest in presbyterum evehi. Fides enim ejus non est ex instituto, sed ex necessitate: nisi forte propter consequens ejus studium et fidem, hominumque raritatem.”<sup>12</sup>

About the same time the council of Laodicea, declared: “Quod oportet eos qui in morbo baptismum accipiunt, et postea convaluerunt, fidem ediscere, et nosse quod divino beneficio digni sunt habiti.” Upon

<sup>12</sup> Concil. edit. Mansi. tom. 2. col. 541. Other early translations of this canon render the first clause by “Si quis—fuerit baptizatus.” The Greek is “εαν νοσων τις φωτισθη.” See the note of Binius on the canon: citing the case of Novatian mentioned above. *Ibid.* col. 550.

Speaking of the conditions under which a relaxation of this rule

might be permitted, Balsamon (whose gloss should be consulted) says: “Nota ergo, quod utrumque debet concurrere, virtutis scilicet studium, et raritas hominum. Si enim unum eorum desit, canon observabitur.” Both Zonaras and Aristenus take the same view. Bevereg. *Pandect. Canon.* tom. 1. p. 412.

this Balsamon observes; (having spoken of the error of some who, in such a case, would rebaptize;) “*Di-cunt ergo patres, quod secundò quidem non baptizabitur: cogetur autem post sanitatem fidem discere, et mysterium baptismatis, et scire quod divino beneficio dignus est habitus, scilicet agnitione ejus qui vere et proprie Deus est, et remissione peccatorum, quam per sanctum baptismum assecutus est.*”<sup>13</sup>

I do not think that I need say more upon this branch of the subject, or collect further evidence, and authorities. We may safely decide that whilst ablution by water, in some mode or other, is of the essence and substance of baptism, yet that immersion is not: and that the sacrament is validly administered, whether it be by immersion, or sprinkling, or affusion.

By the Divine law, and according to the words of our Saviour, the one, namely, ablution by water, is of necessity: the manner in which this ought, in general practice, to be performed, rests upon the just authority and order of the Church, acting within the limits of the power, which, in such matters, she is entitled to exercise. If the Church insists upon either mode,—as, for example, in old time by immersion,—it becomes the bounden duty of her ministers, in all cases, except where obliged otherwise by necessity, to obey her rule: but if, as now in the ritual of our own

---

<sup>13</sup> Bevereg. *Pandect. tom. 1. p.*  
475. Compare also the second  
of the canons of the council of

Nice; and the 80th of the apostolical canons.

Church, either immersion or affusion is allowed,—and neither of them so especially recommended, or insisted on, as that the other is to be regarded as permitted rather than advised,<sup>14</sup>—it must be left to the discretion of the minister to adopt that which he deems the most advisable, whether as agreeing with the usual practice of his own day, or in satisfaction of reasonable demands of scrupulous persons.

To these remarks, I wish that it had been altogether unnecessary for me to add the caution, that, ablution of some kind being thus of the substance of the sacrament, the ministers of our Church should be careful, that on every occasion, ablution actually is

<sup>14</sup> It may be urged that the expressions of our rubric do tend (to say the least) towards advising immersion of infants, rather than mere affusion of the water. For “it shall suffice”—(I acknowledge that “suffice” is a word of much signification)—“it shall suffice to pour water upon the child, if they certify that it is weak.” And therefore, if no such certification is made, the child is to be dipped. But whatever force the word “suffice” may have, it is to be remembered, that immersion is not allowed, unless as plain and decided a certification is given, “that the child may well endure it.” No one, I presume, will deny that in our climate immersion might frequently be attended with

some danger to an infant: brought from a distance in many instances, and unaccustomed to the use of cold water. Affusion, carefully performed, is, beyond all question, a valid administration: it is free from all risk of injury: and I must contend that, no certificate being asked or offered, the common practice of our clergy now, “to pour water,” is both proper and agreeable to the rubric. When they who bring the child “certify” either the one way or the other, the rubric leaves no discretion whatever to the priest; it becomes peremptory; he *must* then, as the case may be, either dip the child in the font, or pour water upon it.

performed.<sup>15</sup> It is impossible to dispute that examples of negligence may have occurred, induced probably by the low and heretical views which some hold of the doctrine itself of Holy Baptism, and not a little increased by the outward indifference displayed, in many places, towards its due administration, as evidenced by the improper preparations which are made; the unseemly basin, and a bare handful, it may be said, of water.

Remembering the objections, which at this time especially are brought by Romanists against the mode of administration of baptism in our Church, I would not allude to them even, far less would I admit that they have any real foundation, if, in my conscience, I could believe that they might boldly and totally be denied. But when we see the tips of fingers dipped, and scarcely dipped, into a small basin of shallow water, and a few drops (possibly attached) sprinkled upon an infant by a minister, heedless, as is evident to all around, where they may chance to fall, we must have sad reason to tremble for the validity of a sacrament so conferred. We must not forget that the infant comes to be washed in the waters of baptism, and not the clothes sprinkled, in which it is wrapped up.

The majority of theologians and canonists hold, and rightly hold, that valid baptism is conferred, even though no more than a single drop of water touch the

---

<sup>15</sup> Compare Sharp on the Rubric, *p.* 25.



person who is to be baptized.<sup>16</sup> This, however, strictly has respect to cases of necessity, although we must not venture to define the limits of the quantity required so exactly, as to assert that it respects cases of necessity alone. But, where there is no necessity, what words can we use sufficiently strong to express our condemnation of those, who,—knowing that our Lord's command is, Baptize with water, knowing the inestimable privileges and blessings conveyed by the due administration of the sacrament, and knowing that the grace of the Holy Spirit is ordinarily tied down and limited within the appointed channels,—nevertheless carelessly run the risk of simulating, instead of really performing, the holy sacrament of baptism?

I have quoted Lyndwood in the note below, and Hostiensis who agrees with him, that by water, though in a very small quantity, even (we may say) by a drop, baptism is validly administered. Some writers on this subject have asserted that the drop of water, when no more (from whatever cause) is used, should be applied to the head: but the better opinion, with Lyndwood and Hostiensis,<sup>17</sup> seems to be, that, although

---

<sup>16</sup> Lyndwood says, having cited the canon-law; “sufficit quod modica stilla aquæ projecta a baptizante tangat baptizandum. Et concordat ibi *Hostien.* qui hoc putat satis consonum esse juri et æquitati.” *lib.* iij. *tit.* 25. Quod in constitutione. *verb.* Immersio. Lyndwood adds, not uncalled for, the words “projecta a baptizante;”

for it is evident that the minister who pronounces the form, “I baptize, *etc.*” should also immerse, or pour the water upon, the person before him.

<sup>17</sup> “Sufficit, quod aqua aspersa tangat aliquam partem corporis, ut dicunt *Inno.* et *Jo. de Deo*, et eorum sequaces.” *Ibid.*

most desirable, it is not essential. These questions, as regards necessity, both as to the part to which the water may be applied, and the quantity, from whatever cause, of the water which is immediately at hand, have respect to occasions of very infrequent occurrence; on which, as I may not pass them over altogether, I shall extract the gloss of Lyndwood upon a part of the same constitution of archbishop Peccham, already referred to.

“ *An puer in utero matris possit baptizari? Si namque adhuc esset in utero, baptizari non potest: de conse. di. 4. c. qui in maternis.* Ratio ibi redditur:<sup>18</sup> et alia ratio est, quia licet talis sit notus Deo, non tamen est notus ecclesiæ, nec subjici potest operationi ministrorum ecclesiæ. Unde et *Aug. li. 2. de baptismo parvulorum*, sic ait: ‘Sicut qui non vixerit, non potest mori; ita qui natus non fuerit, non potest renasci.’—Potest tamen talis ex speciali privilegio Dei in utero sanctificari, et nihilominus natus debet baptizari, quia per baptismum character imprimitur, et augmentum gratiæ confertur, secundum *Jo. in summa confess. li. 3. ti. 24. q. 31.* qui etiam in capitulo ibi sequenti dicit, quod si puer non sit perfecte natus, tamen caput pueri vel aliud membrum apparet, si non timeatur periculum mortis, expectanda est totalis egressio pueri ex utero. Alias autem si periculum mortis immineat, tunc egressa parte principali, sc. capite, in quo operationes animæ

---

<sup>18</sup> “ Quia qui natus adhuc secundum Adam non est, renasci secundum Christum non potest

Neque enim dici regeneratio in eo poterit, quem generatio non præcessit.” *Dist. iv. cap. 115.*

magis manifestantur, ut quidam dicunt, baptizari debet. Non tamen sic erit de aliis partibus, ut de manu, vel pede: quamvis non noceat, si aspergantur partes illæ baptismali aqua, quia divina misericordia non est arctanda. Si tamen postea puer plene nascatur, non est rebaptizandus, secundum quosdam. Et pro hac sententia facit, quod anima est tota in qualibet parte corporis. Et sic sentit *Aster.* dicens, quod si alia pars quam caput abluta sit, et decedat ante perfectam nativitatem, pie potest talis puer reputari baptizatus, ut in cœmeterio sepeliatur. Scias tamen, quod si puer taliter in aliquo membro ante perfectam nativitatem aqua baptismatis ablutus, postea perfecte nascatur, et vivat; non erit malum, si ad majorem cautelam baptizetur sub hac forma; *Si non es baptizatus, etc.*<sup>19</sup>

<sup>19</sup> *Lib. iij. tit. 25. verb.* maternis uteris. Very much, of course, of the interest and importance attached to this question, will depend upon the conclusion which the learned reader may come to, regarding lay-baptism; especially, (as in such cases usually) baptism by women. I shall have to speak somewhat presently upon this point.

It may not be amiss to quote the rubric of the modern Roman ritual: which, it will be seen, adopts much of the view recommended by the canonist in the text; both, indeed, relying on the earlier decisions of the canon-law. "Nemo in utero matris

clausus baptizari debet. Sed si infans caput emiseric, et periculum mortis immineat, baptizetur in capite; nec postea si vivus evaserit, erit iterum baptizandus. At si aliud membrum emiseric, quod vitalem indicet motum, in illo, si periculum impendeat, baptizetur; et tunc, si natus vixerit, erit sub conditione baptizandus.—Si vero ita baptizatus deinde mortuus prodierit ex utero, debet in loco sacro sepeliri." *De sacram. baptismi. tit.* De baptizandis parvulis.

Besides the elaborate work of Cangiamila, compare upon this subject, Aquinas, *Summa, pars. III. quest. lxvij. ll.* who,

Returning, for a moment, to the subject of immersion, I must remind the reader, that for many ages the

declaring it to be “de necessitate baptismi,” that the body of the recipient should be washed with water, concludes that infants cannot be baptized “in maternis uteris.” To the same effect, Scotus: *Rep. Paris. lib. iv. dist. iv. quest. 4.* who answers the argument derived from the examples of John the Baptist, and other saints. So does Peter Lombard. *Sentent. lib. iv. dist. vj.* Also the Pupilla oculi. *pars. ii. cap. ij. L. Manipulus Curatorum. fol. xij. Alaspinaeus. Observat. p. 371.* In short there is a general consent, it may be said, upon the question. The contrary opinion, however, in the last century, was maintained by Michael Gualdo, in a very learned work, “Baptisma infantium in uteris existentium assertum.” *Venet. 1723.*

Connected with it, is one of the inquiries sent to S. Gregory, by S. Augustine of Canterbury, in the 7th century. “X. *Interrogatio.* Si prægnaus mulier debet baptizari? — *Respondit Gregorius.* Hoc non ambigo fraternitatem tuam esse requisitam, cui jam et responsum reddidisse me arbitror. Sed hoc quod ipse dicere et sentire potuisti, credo quia mea apud te volueris responsiona firmari. Mulier etenim prægnaus cur non debeat baptizari, cum non

sit ante omnipotentis Dei oculos culpa aliqua fœcunditas carnis?— Quod ergo naturæ humanæ ex omnipotentis Dei dono servatum est, qua ratione poterit a sacri baptismatis gratia prohiberi? In illo quippe mysterio, in quo omnis culpa funditus extinguitur, valde stultum est, si donum gratiæ contradicere posse videatur.” Wilkins. *Concil. tom. 1. p. 21.* Bedæ, *Hist. Eccles. lib. 1. cap. xxvij.*

But it was argued, that if a woman in a state of pregnancy received manumission, her child also would be free: and therefore baptism of the one, would be also of the other. To this the schoolmen answered: “De manumissione, patet quod puer in utero matris non habet distinctam servitutem à matre respectu dominii temporalis; et ideo manumissio unius est manumissio alterius; quia tamen distinguitur à matre personaliter, ideo habet distinctionem sufficientem ad distincte recipiendum, et contrahendum peccatum originale sicut mater.” Scotus, *ut supra.*

See also Matt. Blastaris, *Synagma. Beverege. Pandect. tom. 2. p. 39.* And the notes of Balsamon, Zonaras, and Aristenus on the vjth canon of the council of Neo-cæsarea, which is directed to this subject. *Ibid. tom. 1. p. 406.*

custom of trine immersion was observed. The fathers are full of testimonies to this fact; which is clear from some passages also already cited above. It is well known that this practice was relaxed, in consequence of the arguments pretended to be based upon it by the Arians, who then appealed to it to prove that the Three Persons of the Undivided Trinity are distinct in substance. Still, the rite of trine immersion continued in force in various parts of the Western Church: and Walafrid Strabo mentions it as of his own time, namely, in the ninth century.<sup>20</sup> I quote the passage, as he refers to two very famous authorities upon whose decision the contrary practice was generally admitted. “Alii trinam immersionem volunt, in similitudinem triduanæ sepulturæ, ut in canonibus apostolorum statutum habetur, et Romanorum consuetudo observat. Alii unam, propter divinitatis unitatem contendunt, ut in concilio Toletano plenissime habetur: ubi etiam commemoratur, quod B. Gregorius interroganti super hoc Leandro, inter cætera ita responderit, quia in una fide nihil officit ecclesiæ consuetudo diversa. Nos autem quod tertio mergimus, triduanæ sepulturæ sacramenta signamus, ut dum tertio ab aquis infans educitur, resurrectio tridui temporis exprimatur.”

---

<sup>20</sup> In the same century, Pascharius Radbert speaks of it as the common custom. *De corpore et sang. Domini. cap. xv.* Martene. *Vet. Script. tom. ix. p. 438.* Compare the treatise by the same,

De fide, etc. *lib. i. cap. ix. ibid. p. 493.* And the ancient account, before referred to, of the rites observed in baptism, addressed to Charlemagne. *Thes. Anecd. tom. i. p. 17.*



Presently he continues, citing the example of S. Laurence,<sup>21</sup> “ Notandum autem, non solum mergendo, verum etiam desuper fundendo, multos baptizatos fuisse, et adhuc posse ita baptizari, si necessitas sit.”<sup>22</sup>

The canon of the council of Toledo, which Strabo refers to, is as follows: after declaring the existence of a variety, in different churches, with respect to immersion; and having referred to the epistle of S. Gregory to Leander; it proceeds, “ Quapropter, quia de utroque sacramento quod fit in sancto baptismo à tanto viro reddita est ratio, quod utrumque rectum, utrumque irreprehensibile in sancta Dei ecclesia habeatur, propter vitandum autem schismatis scandalum, vel hæretici dogmatis usum, simplam teneamus baptismi mersionem: ne videantur apud nos, qui tertio mergunt, hæreticorum probare assertionem, dum sequuntur et morem. Et ne forte cuiquam sit dubium hujus simpli mysterium sacramenti, videat in eo mortem et resurrectionem Christi significari: nam in aquis

<sup>21</sup> See above, *note 7*, p. 60.

<sup>22</sup> De rebus eccles. *cap.* 26. *edit.* Hittorpius. p. 415. This author speaks moderately of the alteration and Use of some churches different from his own. Not so others; see especially the epistles of Alcuin, inveighing bitterly against the admission of one immersion or affusion only. *Epist.* 81. 69. *cit.* Trombelli. *dissert.* xj. p. 23.

The same Alcuin in his book “ de divinis officiis,” describes the

Use of his own time, and after other details, says: “ Deinde baptizat eum sacerdos sub trina mersione tantum, sanctam Trinitatem semel invocando, ita dicens: Et ego te baptizo in nomine Patris; et mergat semel: et Filii; et mergat iterum: et Spiritus Sancti; et mergat tertio.” *Bibl. Patrum. Auct. tom.* 1. p. 259. See also, Rabanas Maurus, de instit. clericorum. *lib.* 1. *cap.* 28. *ibid.* p. 576.

mersio, quasi in infernum descensio est, et rursus ab aquis emersio, resurrectio est. Item videat in eo Unitatem divinitatis, et Trinitatem personarum ostendi: Unitatem, dum semel immergimus; Trinitatem, dum nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti baptizamus.”<sup>23</sup>

Indeed, several centuries after the time of Strabo, it is to be concluded from the manner in which (not to mention other writers) Aquinas has written,<sup>24</sup> that

<sup>23</sup> Concil. Mansi. *tom.* 10. *col.* 619. A. D. 633. For the epistle of S. Gregory see, *Decret.* III. *pars. de consec. dis.* IV. 80. Or his works, *tom.* 2. *col.* 532. in which place is this note, which will serve also to direct the student to some other places of the fathers. “Notandum vero ante S. Gregorium concilia et patres locutos esse de trina immersione, quasi necessaria et ex Dei institutione. De trina mersione agitur de cons. dist. 4. cap. 78, et seqq. Dionysius Ecc. Hier. cap. 2. Tertull. adversus Praxeam, cap. 27. lib. de bapt. et lib. de corona cap. 3. Basilius de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 27. August. serm. 201. de tempore. Ambros. lib. 2. de sacram. cap. 7. Hieronymus contra Lucif.”

<sup>24</sup> Summa. *pars.* III. *quæst.* lxi. *art.* viij. (The edition which I use and have referred to in this dissertation, is that of Rome, 1773, ten vols. fol. commonly said

to be the best. But in this place, not an unimportant one, there is an evident error. The text connects the mention of the continued practice of trine immersion, with the relaxation allowed by the Toletan canon. A reading, not to speak of other objections, unsupported by the canon itself, as it is in the Concilia.) Therefore, I think, we have considerable evidence that trine immersion was observed, in those Churches, so late as the 13th century. It is certain, that some Ordines Romani, of late date, direct baptism so to be administered. See Mabillon, *Mus. Ital.* *tom.* 2. *p.* 106. Or, *Bibliotheca Patrum.* *tom.* 13. *p.* 696.

Having thus Aquinas before us, I would add, that his opinion is clear, that immersion is not, and therefore trine immersion also is not, “de necessitate baptismi.” As regards it, he says; “ea, quæ sunt per accidens, non variant

the custom of trine immersion was still commonly observed abroad : and it is probable, that after a continuance for so long a period of time, in the absence also of any conciliar recommendation, it gave way but very slowly to the new practice, and was upheld with an immoderate zeal for its absolute necessity. In the English church, immersion, according to the Sarum and other manuals, continued to be the rule up to the middle of the sixteenth century ;<sup>25</sup> and this is probably, through its frequent repetitions, to be traced back to the eleventh canon of the synod of Chalcuith, in the beginning of the ninth century : “ Sciant etiam presbyteri, quando sacrum baptismum ministrant, ut non effundant aquam sanctam super capita infantium, sed semper mergantur in lavacro ; sicut exemplum præbuit per semetipsum Dei Filius omni credenti, quando esset ter mersus in undis Jordanis.”<sup>26</sup> By the Common Prayer Book of 1549, a discretion was first distinctly given to the priest to “ pour water,” if the infant was

---

substantiam rei. Per se autem requiritur ad baptismum corporalis ablutio per aquam : unde et baptismus lavacrum nominatur, secundum illud Ephes. 5. Sed quod fiat ablutio hoc, vel illo modo, accidit baptismo : et ideo talis diversitas non tollit unitatem baptismi.” *ibid. art. vij.*

<sup>25</sup> Monum. Ritualia. *vol. 1. p.*  
23. Compare the observation of Raynaldus, upon the canon of the

council of London, in the annals, under the year 1200, *n. xvij.* And the comment of archbishop Lanfranc on the epistle to the Philippians : *ch. iij. v. 10.* “ [*Configuratus morti ejus,*] in baptismo ; ut enim tribus diebus jacuit Christus in sepulchro, sic in baptis mate trina sit immersio.” *Opera, p. 159.*

<sup>26</sup> Wilkins. *Concilia. tom. 1. p. 171.*

weak. It is not unlikely, as it seems to me, that this discretion was practically allowed in the preceding ages; but not recognized, if it may be so said, in the rubric of the various rituals. Thus, the old *Ordinarye of a Chrysten man* speaks of the water being “put upon” the child.

I am not unaware that it is the custom of some of the English clergy, in modern days, to observe trine affusion; repeated at the expression of the Name of each Divine Person: according to the example of antiquity, when immersion was the rule, as described by Alcuin, in the note above; and ordered in the earlier rituals of our Church. If there were no cause to suspect that most unhappy consequences do, indeed, sometimes result from the carelessness of thoughtless ministers, of which I have already spoken plainly, there would be no reason why we should not at once condemn such an observance, at the present time, as not merely improper, but uncalled for. Because, like all similar rites,—neither essential, nor of the substance of the sacrament to which they are attached,—this of trine affusion rests solely upon the authority of the Church:<sup>27</sup> liable therefore to be appointed at one

---

<sup>27</sup> The reader should refer to the glosses of Balsamon and Zonaras upon the 50th apostolical canon: and especially to the note of the very learned editor himself, in the appendix to the second volume of the *Pandects*: p. 29,

where he has collected the testimony of the greatest fathers to the fact of the universal observance, in the primitive ages, of trine immersion, succeeded, in the Western Churches, by trine affusion.

season, and discontinued at another, as may seem to be advisable. As a mere opinion, I do not hesitate to say, that I regret that trine affusion or immersion is not distinctly ordered in our present ritual. It would, in such a case, have been scarcely within the bounds of probability, that baptism, however otherwise negligently administered, could, with regard to this one essential particular, ablution, ever be otherwise than actually performed.

If it may be said, that our rubric leaves the observance indifferent—or rather, that trine immersion or affusion is not clearly prohibited,—let us see how the matter stands. And this we can the best do, by a review of the ancient and later orders of the Church.

The Sarum manual (with which, in this point, the York agrees) thus directs: “ *Deinde accipiat sacerdos infantem,—et—baptizet eum sub trina mersione tantum, sanctam Trinitatem invocando, ita dicens. N. Et ego baptizo te in nomine Patris. Et mergat eum semel versa facie ad aquilonem, et capite versus orientem: et Filii: et iterum mergat semel versa facie ad meridiem: et Spiritus Sancti. Amen. Et mergat tertio recta facie versus aquam.*”<sup>28</sup>

In the first Book of K. Edw. VIth. “ *Then the priest shall take the child in his hands, and——shall dip it in the water thrice,—saying, N. I baptize thee, etc.*” The chief alteration here is, that the right enunciation of the Form is not so strictly explained as in

---

<sup>28</sup> Monumenta Ritualia. vol. 1. p. 23.



the ancient manuals. Probably it was thought that the universal practice would be a sufficient rule.

But,—passing over the intermediate Books of 1552, 1559, and 1604, which did not receive the sanction and approval of convocation; although to them, and particularly to that of 1552, we have to trace the original of many both additions and omissions in our present Book of Common Prayer;—we find this rubric ordered at the last review, in 1662. “*Then the priest shall take the child—and—shall dip it in the water discreetly and warily, saying: N. I baptize thee, etc. But if they certify that the child is weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words.*”<sup>29</sup>

Now, if it is not to be denied, that in the year 1662, the Reviewers (forced by the difficulties of the times in which they lived) had much respect for the Books immediately preceding, yet it is no less true that they had the First Book of K. Edw. VIth also before them, with perhaps the earlier manuals of Sarum and York. And, being so, if we may draw, at any time, any conclusion as to what is or is not intended by

<sup>29</sup> I scarcely think that any one would argue, that in the First Book it is simply ordered with regard to affusion, that, “If the child be weak, it shall suffice to pour water upon it, saying the foresaid words;” and, therefore, at that time, it would have been equally improper to have poured water thrice, instead of once only.

Even if it were not right, following plain common-sense, to interpret this second rubric strictly according to the one which precedes it, and of which it is indeed a part, nothing would be gained respecting the corresponding rubrics in our present Book. There is not, between these, even an apparent contradiction.

omissions or alterations in rubrics, surely in the one which we have been considering. If that is not plain enough, I do not comprehend what is to be understood by the word, plain.

Therefore, I would argue that as the duty of the ministers of every particular Church is to obey her orders as exactly as possible, we must, according to the rubric of our present ritual, dip or pour water upon children brought to be baptized, not thrice, but, once only. It may be true that, in 1662, the object, generally, was to restore the use of the intermediate Books, rather than of the Book, so much superior, of 1549. On the other hand, in this particular, it may be that the reviewers had regard also to questions of high importance, and remembered how, centuries before their time, there had been grievous errors abroad, which demanded a discontinuance of the rite of trine immersion. It must not be overlooked that among the fanatics of that unhappy age, they were not the least dangerous or busy, who held strange heresies regarding the sacrament of baptism, and of the doctrine of the Blessed Trinity. However this may be, I repeat that the rubric is clear and decided: and, lamenting the miserable scandal which lately has been brought against the validity of baptisms conferred in our Church, and still more deeply that there has ever existed a shadow of foundation for it, it remains for us earnestly to endeavour to put an end to suspicion in future, not by overstepping the bounds within which we are to work, but, by a most solemn and reverent care that

we always “rightly and duly administer that holy sacrament.”

This subject is not to be passed away from, without one more remark. I have gone to the full length of concession, with regard to the objections to which I have alluded, in admitting that they have any foundation. My sole reason for that admission is, that the attention of the clergy may be especially directed, at all times, to a very careful obedience to the plain directions which they have undertaken to observe. For, stript of the gross exaggerations in which they have been involved, those objections do not rest upon any such ground, as is sufficient to warrant one Church, in rejecting wholly, and without even an attempt at discrimination or inquiry, the baptisms administered in another Church. Amongst a multitude of ministers, it must be, that in every Church, in spite of warnings and exhortation, some negligence will occasionally happen: and, it must be confessed, the apparent consequences, so far as we know, will ensue. But, if we listen to the voice of true Christian charity, which “hopeth all things;” and, not only so, but to the dictates of sound Christian theology; all such instances (the particular occurrence of which it is almost impossible to detect and prove) are, humbly, to be left at the disposal of the Most High. If we were inclined to retort, and to receive and argue upon doctrines acknowledged by members of the church of Rome, it is obvious that we might object against the validity of the administration of any sacrament,

when it is made to depend upon the superadded essential of "intention" in the minister. Doubtful in such a way, and to such a degree, that no care or reverence as to all visible essentials can possibly satisfy any one, except the minister himself, of the reality of the sacrament, which he professes to perform.

## CHAPTER IV.

**B**EFORE we proceed to the consideration of the next part of our subject, there is still one more particular to be noticed, respecting the water used in baptism; namely, the benediction of it. This rite, deduced from the most remote antiquity, and constantly observed, whenever practicable, in all branches of the catholic Church,<sup>1</sup> occupies, as might have been expected, a conspicuous place in our present offices of public baptism.

This previous hallowing or benediction of the water cannot, of course, be accounted an essential of the valid administration of Holy Baptism, and therefore, when necessity so requires it, it may be justly omitted. This necessity can only take place, either when baptism is administered by some lay person, to whom the performance of this office of hallowing is not permitted: or when death appears to be so immediate, as not to suffer the least delay. In all other cases of private baptism, the prayer of benediction ought to be

---

<sup>1</sup> See the various Orders, edited by Martene. *De ant. Ecc. rit.* tom. 1. Goar, *Rituale Græc.* p. 353. Asseman, *Codex. Lit.* tom. 2. Thomasius, *Codd. sa-*

*cram. Opera. tom. 6.* So also Dr. Comber. "The primitive Christians did always use a prayer for the consecrating of the water." *Companion. vol. 3. p. 400.*



included by the priests of the church of England, according to her own recommendation, among those which “the present time or exigence will suffer,” as the rubric expresses it.

The fact, that this benediction is not of the essence of the sacrament<sup>2</sup> (which indeed never, that I remember, was pretended by any writer), has induced foreign protestants to speak of it as of no importance whatsoever, in their eagerness to undervalue and disparage the sacraments in every way. It is not worth while to bring forward evidence of this from writers of extreme views: but take Chemnitz and Vossius;<sup>3</sup> both these

---

<sup>2</sup> It was anciently regarded as, in some sort, a sacramental, and not, therefore, a sacrament. See Waldensis, *de sacramentalibus bapt. cap. 51. Opera. tom. 3. p. 331.*

According to the modern doctrine of the church of Rome, sacramentals, strictly, are so called, not because they are ceremonies of, or pertain to, the completion of sacraments, but on account of a certain similitude which they have to them; insomuch, that as by the one justifying grace is conveyed, so by the other is given remission of venial sins. The number of the sacramentals is comprised in the verse:

“Orans, tinctus, edens, confessus, dans, benedicens.”

These relate, 1. to the saying of

the Lord's prayer, or other prayers solemnly prescribed by the Church. 2. the aspersion “aquæ benedictæ,” of holy water. 3. signifies the “panis benedictus,” which anciently, by the common practice of almost all churches, was given in the place of the eucharist to non-communicants. (See, *Monum. Rit. vol. 1. p. cclviii.*) 4. The general confession which precedes the celebration of mass. 5. Almsgiving. 6. Benediction by bishops and abbots.

The same theology also teaches that by sacramentals remission of venial sins is obtained, *ex opere operantis*, not *ex opere operato*.

<sup>3</sup> Examen concil. Trident. *pars. 2. p. 41. De Bapt. p. 28.*

So, in like manner, the Wal-

seem to regard consecration of the water as quite unnecessary at all times, even of solemnity; and as a relic of superstition, wisely to be discontinued. Not so, happily, did our Church judge; she has not, by the grace of God, thrown aside all of those decent ceremonies which had been observed from century to century up to the age itself of the apostles.

The benediction of the water, as it stands in our present ritual, is conveyed in plain and suitable words, though brief: "Almighty, everliving God,—regard, we beseech thee, the supplications of thy congregation; sanctify this Water to the mystical washing away of sin; and grant that this child now to be baptized therein, may receive the fulness of thy grace, and ever remain in the number of thy faithful and elect children; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen."

There can be no question that in this form of benediction, there is a sufficient designation of the water, at that time before the minister; and also, a sufficient separation of it from secular and common, to holy use. It is plainly identified and set apart by the words, "this Water;" and, "therein."<sup>4</sup> Anciently in our

---

denses, Albigenses, and other heretics of the middle ages; mocking at all benedictions and ceremonies used in the solemn administration of baptism. This is scarcely to be wondered at in sects which openly denied the grace of that sacrament: making it depend upon the faith and merits of the reci-

pient: and declaring that Jews, sincere in their own religion, might be saved without it. Porter. *Systema*. p. 416. 418. 430. Cf. S. Augustin. *hæres*. 46. (Of the Manichees.)

<sup>4</sup> This was acknowledged and frequently objected against by the puritans in the xvjth and xvijth

own Church (and still, in a vast majority of the churches of Christendom), there were several ceremonies appointed, significant of the rite which was being performed. Indeed, the "benedictio fontis" formed a complete service in itself: the more required, at a time when the hallowed water was kept until unfit for use, ready for any baptisms which were demanded, and not poured away immediately after any one was finished.<sup>5</sup>

centuries. Thus, in the Survey of the Common prayer, 1604, the 90th query, grounded on this prayer, is: "Whether this be not an hallowing of the water, which is then in the font, that so it might be more holy, and fit for baptizing?" The argument why it should not be so is curious: "as if bread and wine be not sanctified by Christ his institution, except every loafe and pot of wine be hallowed by speciall words of consecration.—Now that which is conceived of bread and wine, may also be conceived of water in baptisme." *p.* 91. In other words: the water in the font need not be hallowed, *because* it is not necessary to consecrate, by special Form of words, the bread and wine, in the sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist.

About the year 1570, a tract specifying "the lawes and ceremonies of Antichrist, remaining in our English Church unre-

formed," notices, amongst other things, "godfathers and godmothers;" and "the conjured fonte." *Parte of a Register, p.* 65.

<sup>5</sup> This Order, according to the old Use of Sarum, is to be found in the Monumenta Ritualia. *vol.* 1. *p.* 13—21. The First Book of K. Edward had also a separate Form of benediction of the font: for then the water was required to be renewed not oftener than "*every month once at the least.*" But in that Book the only ceremony retained was the sign of the cross, over or in the water. Bucer, however, who liked nothing but the weak fancies of his own brain, objected to this separate Form, and it was discontinued. But the greatest part of it was introduced into the intermediate Books, and, at length, all that was essential was restored in 1662. See Wheatley's remarks upon this. *p.* 338.

Besides this present benediction

Although it may have been well that some of these ceremonies, which, during a long lapse of ages, had

of fresh water in the font, whenever it was required, there were also two occasions, Easter and Whitsuntide, when the rite was performed with especial solemnity. The *Liber Festivalis* (a book, I must observe, not to be quoted except as a witness to matters of fact,) explains the ancient custom of the English church. "Holy chyrche vseth all y<sup>e</sup> ester weke to go a processyon to the font, that is now the reed see to all crysten people that ben chrystened in the font. For the water in the font betokeneth the reed see, for blode and water is the wounde that was in Christes syde, in y<sup>e</sup> whiche the power of Pharao the fende of hell is drowned and all his myght, and chrysten people saued. And for the font is halowed on eester euen and on Whytson euen, for in y<sup>e</sup> begynnyng all chylde abode to be chrystened unto these two dayes, and so to be chrystened at the font halowyng. But now for bycause that so many in so long abydyng were deed withouten chrystendome, therefore holy chyrche ordeyneth now to chrysten at all times of y<sup>e</sup> yere: saue viij. dayes before these euens, y<sup>e</sup> chylde shall abyde to the font halowyng yf it may for perill of deth, and elles not." *fol.* xxxij.

*feria. iiij. post festum palmarum.*

I may here remark, by the way, that the English church in those ages seems to have settled down into this practice, as a sort of mean between the stricter rule of the constitution of Otho, [*cap.* Ad baptismum; and see Athon's commentary, *verb.* solenniter.] insisting on the earlier canons, and the laxity of indifference about it which he condemned. Archbishop Peckham in 1281, practically abrogated the constitution of Otho; declaring that at all other times of the year, except the eight days before those eves, people should be at liberty to bring their children to be baptized, though in no danger of death; "juxta vetustam consuetudinem." On which word Lyndwood glosses: "Quæ dicitur optima legum interpret." *lib.* iiij. *tit.* 25. Quod in constitutione. Compare in the Saxon age, the laws of Ina, and of the Northumbrian priests. *Wilkins. tom.* 1. *p.* 58. 218.

From what archbishop Cranmer asserts in his answer to the sixth article of the Devonshire rebels (complaining of the new rubric in the Book of 1549, that baptisms were to be performed in church only on sundays and holydays),

accumulated beyond the example of the first centuries of the Church, should have been dispensed with at the revision of our Service Book, in 1662, it must yet

it would appear that even the injunctions as to Easter and Whitsuntide had of late years been practically disregarded. "Every Easter and Whitsun-even," says the archbishop, "until this time, the fonts were hallowed in every church, and many collects and other prayers were read for them that were baptized. But all was in vain, and as it were a mocking with God. For none were baptized at those times, except it were by chance, but all were baptized before." He says again, presently afterwards; "The order and form of christening was read and kept every year at Easter and Whitsuntide, but none was then christened." *Works. vol. 2. p. 223.*

I believe that the archbishop is here to be understood to be speaking solely of the form of hallowing the Font: which continued to be the practice on the great Eves, up to the revision of the rituals in that reign. Nor, so far as I can see, was it an improper, or even an idle ceremony, much less a mocking with God: but a keeping up of the memory of earlier practice in purer days, and always in expectation, at least, of some children about to be brought for baptism. It is more than absurd,

—it is a sheer impossibility—to suppose that the Office of baptism itself was performed (as the words of the extract would at first sight seem to mean), whether any children were baptized or not: in fact, it was distinctly forbidden.

I would add that at other times of the year, and under certain circumstances, delay in bringing children to be baptized proved a frequent ground of proceeding in the ecclesiastical courts, in the xvth century. See archdeacon Hale's *Precedents, &c. n. vj.*

The restriction of solemn baptisms in churches, to sundays and holydays, was much objected to by the puritans: as in the Survey of the Common Prayer, 1605. *p. 84.* Becon's *reliques, fol. 95.*

On the general inquiry into the reasons and antiquity of baptism at especial great and holy seasons, see Bingham, *book xi. ch. vj.* Liber Diurnus, *p. 115.* and the gloss of Balsamon, and Zonaras, on the 45th canon of the council of Laodicea. *Bevereg. pandect. tom. 1. p. 474.*

From Alcuin it appears that, very anciently, at Easter and Pentecost, the hour for the solemnity was the ninth hour. *De div. off. Auct. tom. 1. p. 258.*



remain a question, whether it was not exceeding primitive simplicity, to omit, altogether, any direction for an outward gesture, which should accompany the prayer of benediction. Hence arises a practical difficulty, to be argued on very different grounds from those with which we were concerned, in treating of trine immersion. As regarded that, there is in our ritual now, not only no direction to observe the ancient practice, but a plain order to observe the new. This cannot be said of the rite of benediction: and I would not hastily condemn the custom, which is very widely followed by our clergy, of dipping the right hand into the font, during the recital of the words which I have specified above, as containing the form of hallowing or benediction.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> In the bottom of the basin of all Fonts, which are correctly made (certainly in all ancient ones), there are a plug and a drain by which the water may be conveyed away, when it has been used. It is a part of the duty of the priest to take care, by doing it himself after the Office is finished, that the hallowed water be so poured away. In former days, as I have already observed, the water, having received the benediction, was retained for many baptisms: either for a specified period, or so long as it would keep pure. But then there were strict injunctions that all fonts should

be kept locked. See the *Monumenta Ritualia. vol. 3. p. 374.* At present, immediately before every administration, the rubric says, "*And the Priest coming to the Font (which is then to be filled with pure water), etc.*" The wording of this is somewhat ambiguous; but, coupled with the consideration that there is no permission to omit the prayer of benediction, the reasonable conclusion is, that the water is not to be reserved from one time to another. A repeated benediction of the same water would be improper.

Hence arises another reason why the ordinaries should see that

There is a passage in the works of archbishop Cranmer, in which perhaps he refers to this benediction of

---

all churches are provided with fonts. Where basins are indecently allowed to be used, the water is almost always carelessly left to be disposed of (somewhere or other) by a servant of the church. Such things as these may, possibly, seem to some persons, matters of slight or of no importance. I do not so regard them. No detail is of little consequence in the administration of the Divine Sacraments of our Blessed Lord: nor can we say how much of the irreverence so sadly shewn to them by the people now-a-days, is to be traced to the irreverence with which they have been performed by too many of the clergy.

I need hardly add that after a private baptism, the water should, no less heedfully, be poured away by the minister. Whether hallowed or not, it has been put to a holy use. As to the *vessel* used, see the provincial constitution of archbishop Edmund: "*vas vel comburatur, vel ad usus ecclesiæ deputetur.*" *Wilkins. tom. 1. p. 636.*

I would desire not to be misunderstood in insisting here, and elsewhere, on the decency, nay, the necessity, of using fonts instead of basins in churches. However strongly urged, we must yet

agree with archbishop Cranmer that "in baptism we receive the Holy Ghost, and put Christ upon us, as well if we be christened in one dish full of water taken out of the font, as if we were christened in the whole font or river."

*Answer to Gardyner. Works. vol. 3. p. 118.* But this consideration, most true though it is, does not alter in any degree the extent of the obligation which lies upon the clergy, to put an end as far as each one may, to the negligent permission of basins in churches, instead of fonts. Such permission is happily becoming daily of more rare occurrence: but wherever continued, it is in plain violation of reiterated canons and injunctions. I cannot believe that it is ever to be referred to any notion or fancy beyond mere carelessness and ignorance: for this would be to bring the far more serious charge of intentional disobedience with a most mean and miserable purpose.

Returning to the subject of hallowing fresh water at each baptism, I would add that it would appear from the way in which Arcudius speaks, that the custom of the Greek Church is the same as our own. This however, in their case, arises from their prac-

the water, although it is not so clear as to be directly insisted on: he says, "In baptism we come not unto the water as we come to other common waters, when we wash our hands or bathe our bodies, but we know that it is a mystical water, admonishing us of the great and manifold mercies of God towards us, of the league and promise made between Him and us, and of His wonderful working and operation in us." Now, if it may be argued that possibly here the archbishop was alluding rather to the essential "Invocation," than to the accidental benediction, yet the statement is so justly adapted to the latter, that it is well deserving the reader's consideration.<sup>7</sup>

tice of immersion. He says (of the water); "Est vera, et naturalis, non tamen simplex, sed benedicta, quam sacerdos Græcus cum vult baptizare unum, aut plures eodem tempore benedicit, et deinde in locum honestum abjicit. Cum enim Græci soleant infantes totos in aquam mergere (quæ etiam causa potissima est, cur aquam calefaciant) non videtur honestum, moraliter loquendo, ut eadem aqua, quippe quodammodo polluta, diu servetur, ut aliis baptizandis inservire debeat: solum inservit præsentibus, si qui sunt, qui lustrari baptismate velint." *De concordia Ecc. occidentalis et orient. lib. 1. cap. vij.*

There is a rubric also, in the revised Roman ritual, which is

directed to the same point. "Ubi vero baptismus fit per infusionem aquæ, cavendum est, ne aqua ex infantis capite in fontem, sed vel in sacrarium baptisterii prope ipsum fontem extractum defluat, aut in aliquo vase, ad hunc usum parato, recepta, in ipsius baptisterii vel in ecclesiæ sacrarium effundatur." Catalani explains this to be appointed because two baptisms should not be administered with the same water: and that the last clause of the rubric refers to cases of private baptism. *Comment. in rit. Rom. tom. 1. p. 44.* So, again, Baruffaldus, *Comment. tit. v. § 5.*

<sup>7</sup> Works. vol. 3. p. 11. Compare a corresponding place: *ibid. p. 281.*

I have said above, that the benediction of the font is a rite to be deduced from the most remote antiquity. The prayer indeed, which of old was said in our Church, is grounded on the truth, according to the common consent of the fathers: “Deus, cujus Spiritus super aquas inter ipsa mundi primordia ferebatur, ut jam tunc virtutem sanctificationis aquarum natura conciperet: *etc.*”<sup>8</sup> And again, that, as we now assert, the Almighty God “by the baptism of His well-beloved Son Jesus Christ, in the river Jordan, did sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin.”<sup>9</sup> But, though all water has thus, so far, been sanctified, it has been the practice, from the primitive ages, specially to hallow, by prayer and benediction, that quantity of water, which is to be applied to the purposes of Christian baptism.

It may be, or it may not be, too much to say that, in so doing, the Church has been simply imitating the practice of the apostles themselves. Whether the famous canon of Vincentius comes in here, may be left to the judgment of the reader.

When, also, in examining the writings of the fathers he finds the prayer of invocation and the consequent benediction of the font mentioned, he must

---

<sup>8</sup> Monumen. Ritualia. *vol.* 1. *p.* 18.

<sup>9</sup> So venerable Bede speaks: “Dignatus est [Filius Dei] lavari aquis Jordanicis, qui erat mundus a sordibus cunctis, ut ad

diluendas nostrorum sordes scelerum omnium fluentia sanctificaret aquarum.” *Homil.* xxij. *Opera.* *tom.* 5. *p.* 164. This is a point to which the reader’s attention will again be directed presently.

also decide whether it does or does not relate merely to the proper Form, "In the Name, *etc.*" A careful consideration of the context will enable him to distinguish this correctly in most instances. For he must avoid applying to the rite of benediction which is not essential, any proofs which are to be referred to the true invocation of the Three Persons of the Undivided Trinity which is essential, to the right performance of the sacrament. As, for example, that place from S. Ambrose, in the canon-law: "Non omnis aqua sanat, sed aqua sanat, quæ habet gratiam Christi. Aliud est elementum, aliud consecratio:—non sanat aqua, nisi Spiritus Sanctus descenderit; *etc.*"<sup>10</sup> And where Ælfric says of the martyr and deacon S. Laurence, in the case already mentioned, "he hallowed the water [ðā hrædlice þæt wæter gehalgode] and baptized him."<sup>11</sup> In the same way also, the otherwise somewhat obscure phrase in the famous decree of union after the council of Florence: "—quoniam cum principalis causa, ex qua baptismus virtutem habet, sit Sancta Trinitas, instrumentalis autem sit minister qui tradit exterius sacramentum, si exprimitur actus, qui per

---

<sup>10</sup> De consecr. *Dist. iv. cap. 9.* On the other hand, I must notice, that the benediction of the font was very anciently performed with a triple prayer; each Divine Person being distinctly invoked. See Amalarius: *de Eccles. Off. lib. 1. cap. xxv. Auct. bibl. Pa-*

*trum. tom. 1. p. 350.* This remark applies with greater force, perhaps, to the statement just following in the text, from the decree of union.

<sup>11</sup> Homily on the passion of S. Laurence. *vol. 1. p. 429.*



ipsum exercetur ministrum, cum Sanctæ Trinitatis invocatione, perficitur sacramentum.”<sup>12</sup>

The apostolical constitutions (and later than the beginning of the third century they cannot be; probably, in the main, much earlier;) are clear as to the observance of their own time, nor do they speak of it as a novel introduction. The subject is the preparation for baptism. “Deinde venit ad aquam. Sacerdos autem benedicit ac laudat Dominum Deum omnipotentem; *etc.*——Ipsum ergo et nunc invocet sacerdos sub baptismum, ac dicat: ‘Respice de cœlo, et sanctifica hanc aquam; da vero gratiam et virtutem, ut qui baptizatur, secundum mandatum Christi tui, cum eodem crucifigatur, et commoriatur, et consepeliatur, et consuscitetur in adoptionem quæ in eo fit, ut perimatur quidem peccato, vivat autem justitiæ.’”<sup>13</sup> The words “sanctifica hanc aquam,” and the sense of the remainder of this benediction, are the same, it will be remarked, as in our ritual now.

Again; Tertullian, in the often-quoted tract *de baptismo*, seems to connect the grace which is conveyed by the Holy Spirit in baptism with the use of invocation and benediction of the water. Whether this be so or not, he is a witness to the fact of the practice in his own day. “Igitur omnes aquæ de pristina originis prærogativa sacramentum sanctificationis consequuntur, invocato Deo. Supervenit enim

<sup>12</sup> Mansi. *Concil. tom.* 31. *col.* 1055.

<sup>13</sup> *Lib.* 7. *cap.* xliij.

statim Spiritus de cœlis, et aquis superest, sanctificans eas de semetipso, et ita sanctificatæ, vim sanctificandi combibunt.”<sup>14</sup>

S. Cyprian’s testimony is undeniable : and here, again, I omit all consideration of the doctrine which he advocates. He is writing to Januarius and others, on the question of baptizing heretics, seeking admission into the Church : and he says ; “ divina scriptura moneat et dicat, ‘ ab aqua aliena abstine te, et a fonte aquæ alienæ ne biberis.’ Oportet ergo mundari et sanctificari aquam prius a sacerdote, ut possit baptismo suo peccata hominis qui baptizatur abluere : quia per Ezechielem prophetam Dominus dicit : ‘ Et aspergam super vos aquam mundam.’ Quomodo autem mundare et sanctificare aquam potest qui ipse immundus est, *etc.*”<sup>15</sup>

Once more : S. Ambrose, in his treatise on the sacraments. “ Cum forma baptismatis et usus hoc habeat, ut ante fons consecratur, et tunc descendat qui baptizandus est. Nam ubi primum ingreditur sacerdos, exorcismum facit secundum creaturam aquæ, in-

<sup>14</sup> §. iv. Opera. p. 225. Compare the close of the same section. “ Igitur medicatis quodammodo aquis, *etc.*”

<sup>15</sup> *Epist.* lxx. Opera. p. 125.

If the treatise sometimes ascribed to S. Cyprian be indeed his, there is a remarkable passage in it, which might be insisted on : he is speaking of the Holy Inno-

cents. “ Hi nuper cruore lacteo loti primitias baptismi martyrio consecrarunt, tradentes posteris formam, ubi necessitatis articulus excluserit moram ; non minus ad lavacrum animæ sanguinem efficacem, quam sanctificatas verbis solennibus aquas.” Ibid. *app.* p. xcij. On the text, above, from Ezekiel, see, before, p. 41.

vocationem postea et precem defert: ut sanctificetur fons, et adsit præsentia Trinitatis æternæ.”<sup>16</sup> Again, in the fifth chapter of the second book: “Nunc ergo consideremus. Venit sacerdos, precem dicit ad fontem, invocat Patris nomen, præsentiam Filii et Spiritus Sancti: utitur verbis cœlestibus.”<sup>17</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *Opera. tom. 2. p. 353.* The note of the editors upon this passage should be consulted: and the student will do well, also, to compare the sacramentaries of S. Gregory, and other early rituals in the large collections made by

Mabillon, Martene, Asseman, and Muratori.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid. p. 357.* See also, *De mysteriis. cap. iij. Ibid. p. 328.* and, again, the note of the editors, and the reference to bishop Fell's edition of S. Cyprian.

## CHAPTER V.



SHALL now pass on, in this chapter, to the consideration of the second particular which is essential to the valid administration of the sacrament of Holy Baptism : namely, the Form.

That the use of a certain form of words is believed by the church of England to be essential to the right administration of baptism,—and, again, that the use of some forms of words renders it invalid,—is clear from the questions which, by her ritual, are appointed to be put to those, who bring to the church a child, which has been baptized privately, or at home. The minister of the parish, when such a case occurs, is enjoined to examine whether the statement, that the child is indeed already baptized, is correct or incorrect. Having inquired as to the person by whom the sacrament is said to have been administered, and as to who were present on the occasion, he is further directed to say ; “ Because some things essential to this sacrament may happen to be omitted through fear or haste, in such times of extremity ; therefore I demand further of you,—with what words was this child baptized ? ”

The form which is appointed to be used in our Church, is that which is adopted by the whole Western

Church, containing an express and distinct invocation of the Three Divine Persons of the Undivided Trinity.<sup>1</sup> “I baptize thee In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” These are the words which are to be said either at the public or private baptism of infants or adults; or, in cases of hypothetical baptism, after the declaration of the doubt. So also, in the catechism: we are told that “the person is baptized, *In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.*”

This was the ancient form from time immemorial. It thus stands in the old manuals, for all solemn and public occasions. “Ego baptizo te in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.”<sup>2</sup> I have said, solemn

---

<sup>1</sup> I must once more remind the reader that there are places in the fathers, in which “the benediction of the water” must probably be referred, not to the prayer of benediction or consecration, of which I have spoken in the preceding chapter, but to this Invocation or form, by virtue of which the simple element of water is sufficiently endued with its mysterious powers. In all such passages, the student must carefully decide for himself, to which prayer or invocation the writer alludes. Still he must not hastily conclude with Albertin, *de eucharistia*, lib. 1. cap. 5, that the primitive fathers knew of no other benedictory prayers than this Invoca-

tion: for that would be nothing less than to deny the plain meaning of innumerable testimonies to the contrary. Albertin himself begs the question where he asserts, that the ancients *must* have referred to the evangelical words “In the Name *etc.*,” because there are no other prayers instituted by our Lord for the consecration of the water.

<sup>2</sup> Quite in accordance were the repeated canons of the English councils. See, for example, Concilia, tom. 1. p. 575. 593. tom. 2. p. 131. And (for the latest) perhaps enforcing of the Latin form, the Reformatio Angliæ, *decr.* ij. fol. 7. Compare the Manipulus curatorum, cap. iij.



and public occasions, because it was not of absolute necessity, that the Latin form should be used: in cases of private baptism, it would frequently happen that persons ignorant of Latin might alone happen to be at hand. A constitution of archbishop Peccham, in the year 1281, is directed to this point. “*Forma autem sacramenti in vulgari lingua consistit non solum in signis,<sup>3</sup> verumetiam in ordine eorundem verborum, quibus ipsum est divinitus sacramentum institutum, quo Christus Dominus illis verbis et taliter ordinatis, ut sunt in lingua Latina, regenerativam con-*

<sup>3</sup> “*In signis. sc. exterioribus; qualia sunt signatio in fronte et in pectore. Item exsufflatio. Salis datio. Item salivæ ad nares et aures appositio. Item pectoris et inter scapulas cum oleo inunctio. Item fontis consecratio. Item patrinorum accessio. Item in vertice chrismatio. Item candidæ vestis cum cereo traditio. Ista enim sunt potius de solemnitate baptismi quam de substantia, juxta illud metricum:*

Sal, oleum, chrisma, cereus, chrismale, saliva,  
 Flatus, virtutem baptismatis ista  
 figurant:  
 Hæc cum patrinis non mutant  
 esse, sed ornant.”

Lyndwood. *lib. iij. tit. 24*. Compare the whole Office of public baptism, reprinted in the Monu-

menta Ritualia, *vol. 1*.

The old author from whom Lyndwood quotes has comprehended (I would add) the Essentials in two other lines:

“Cum tincto tingens, intentio, post  
 aqua, forma  
 Verborum, faciunt, ut sit baptismatis esse.”

Henricus de Vurima, *in quartam sentent. Cf. Walafrid Strabo: de rebus Ecc. cap. 26*.

“Restat jam tractare de forma baptismi: quæ est hæc. Ego baptizo te in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Amen. Quæ forma verborum, cum magna cautela et distincte est proferenda: ne vitietur, ac per hoc virtus sacramenti baptismi evacuetur.”  
*Pupilla Oculi. pars. 2. cap. iij.*

tulit potestatem. Dicatur ergo à sic baptizantibus, ‘*I Christen thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost :*’ vel alias in lingua materna secundum consuetudinem patriæ, vel in Gallico sic: ‘*Je te baptize au nom du Pere, et du Filz, et du Saint Esperit.*’”<sup>4</sup>

To return to our present Ritual. Such then being the form appointed, and such being the question with regard to it, ordered to be put to those who bring to the minister of a parish a child supposed to be already baptized, it immediately occurs to us to inquire, whether the actual use of the appointed form, and of that alone, word for word as it is to be said in public, without any addition, alteration, or omission whatsoever, is of absolute necessity? If it be so, it is evident, that not in this Church only but in all others, baptism administered under any other form must be invalid. For, this is not a point affecting the outward decency or solemnity, but the very substance, of the sacrament. But,—not to speak of the alteration which cannot but follow in the form, by the change from the vulgar tongue into any other,—it would be both unreasonable and contrary to the opinion of the Church, to tie down the form so exactly to the use of the certain words, ordered to be said on solemn occasions. In

---

<sup>4</sup> “ Quid si Latinus non in Latina lingua, sed in Græca, vel in Hebraica, vel alia extranea baptizat aliquem, et profert verba apta et congrua? baptismus tenet;

nam et apostoli variis linguis loquebantur; et forma realis potius attendenda est, quam verbalis.” Hostiensis, in *Summa*, lib. III. rubr. xlij. §. 6.

venturing, however, to extend the limits of the words within which a valid form can be held to exist, we must be very careful not to exceed the bounds, laid down respecting them by various decisions and authorities of the Church.

In the first place it is well known, that whilst the Western Church, for many ages, as has been already remarked, has used a form beginning, "I baptize thee," "baptizo te;" the form, upon the other hand, in the Greek Church, has been, and continues to be, "Βαπτίζεται ὁ δοῦλος τοῦ Θεοῦ. Ὁ δεῖνα. εἰς τὸ ὄνομα." *etc.* "Baptizatur servus Dei, *etc.*"<sup>5</sup> The Armenian ritual agrees with this, and also that appointed in the churches of Antioch and Jerusalem.<sup>6</sup>

If, therefore, whether in the Latin or the vernacular of any country, it is essential that the form should commence with the words "I baptize thee" or their equivalents, the baptism administered in the Eastern

<sup>5</sup> Goar. *Rituale. Græc. p.* 355. So, in the same way, at the anointing which, according to that ritual, immediately precedes baptism: the words are "χρίεται ὁ δοῦλος," *etc.* "Ungitur servus Dei."

I add part of Goar's note upon this form. "Propter dictionis βαπτίζεται affinitatem, ad aliam vocem Latinam, *baptizetur*, commementi sunt quidam Græcos in baptismate deprecatoria vel imperativa forma uti; quo vel leniter

perspecto, cessant quæstiones ex præsentium verborum inscitia ortæ." The student will frequently find it stated in books of considerable authority, that the Greek form is "baptizetur."

<sup>6</sup> Asseman. *Codex. lit. tom.* 2. *p.* 200. 225. On the other hand, the Coptic and Ethiopic churches order the form "I baptize thee." So also, the Chaldee and Malabar rituals. *Ibid. p.* 180. 212.

Churches, which I have mentioned by way only of example, must be accounted invalid. So, it might be argued with respect to other alterations, and additions, of which we have frequent instances in both ancient and modern rituals.

But this, I need scarcely remind the reader, is contrary to the established and uniform doctrine of the Catholic Church. Within limits, varieties in the form have always been permitted, and baptisms administered by them are acknowledged to be valid.

It will be evident presently, from what will follow, that it is scarcely possible to define exactly those limits: but, at least, it is to be allowed as a certain rule, as regards the form, that a baptism cannot be admitted to be valid which has not been given, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: or, in other words; which has been conferred by a form, in which there is not made a plain and distinct mention of each Divine Person of the ever-blessed and Undivided Trinity.

This rule is to be traced for its correctness, to the source from Whence flow all the blessings which baptism conveys: namely, to the Author of the Sacrament itself. He it was Who instituted it, and He alone could direct and appoint all its details and necessary particulars. Antecedently, it depended upon His will and omniscience whether any form, or what form, was to be used: after His decision, it only remained for the members of His Church to obey His commands as strictly as they might. The commission which our

Blessed Lord gave to his disciples was this: "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

The consent of the fathers upon this point is unanimous. From many places which have been collected, by various writers, from their books, I shall select a few and lay them before the reader. The tradition of the whole Church, from the first centuries to the present hour, will be found to be clear and constant: supplying, by the proof of her undeviating practice and doctrine, that which our Lord Himself, Who left her as the witness and keeper of the truth, did not expressly say; namely, that all who should seek to be admitted into the One Fold, are to be baptized under the pronounced invocation, that is in the Name, of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He gave the command: and the Church, divinely guided by the influence of the Holy Spirit, knew infallibly the only meaning in which that command could rightly be understood; and, from the beginning, has both so interpreted and so obeyed it.

Nor, (though such is not to be required,) does this form fail to commend itself even to our own judgment. The sacrament of baptism is the sacrament of faith; in other words, the solemn profession upon our parts of belief in the Christian religion. Wherefore the apostle speaks to the Hebrews who had been baptized, as having been "once enlightened," and again as



having been “illuminated.”<sup>7</sup> So that the declaration of the doctrine of the Ever-blessed Trinity,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,—was fitly to be joined for ever to the administration of baptism, as that doctrine, the truth of which, especially and above all others, the new converts were to confess. This, as concerned the recipients: so, equally, as to the minister and all who should be present. Baptism is the entrance into the Church; the first beginning of the spiritual life; therefore at such a time, the certainty of that mysterious truth, the Trinity in Unity,—from Whence spring all the graces and blessings which the sacraments convey,—should be especially proclaimed. In the Eucharist there is always, doubtless, a virtual and implicit recognition of the same doctrine: but in baptism there must be an express mention and most plain commemoration of it.<sup>8</sup>

The Sacred Scriptures themselves are not without indications that some form was used in the administration of baptism. I would leave these without remark, especially as upon the first I shall have to speak further presently. In the 19th ch. of the Acts, it is

<sup>7</sup> *Ch. vj. v. 4. Ch. x. v. 32.*

<sup>8</sup> Every student in theology knows how often the form in baptism has been appealed to in proof of the true doctrine of the Trinity in Unity, and how vainly the Socinians of modern times have struggled to evade the force of it.

See, besides others, Bull, *Judicium ecc. cathol. lib. iv. iij.* Petavius. *Opera. tom. 2. p. 92. 103. pars. 11. p. 63.* Waterland. *Moyer Lectures. viij.* Melancthon. *Loci comm. Opera. tom. 1. p. 151. de Spiritu S. tom. 2. p. 332.*

written that S. Paul inquired of certain disciples at Ephesus (finding that they had “not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost,”) unto what then they had been baptized? “And they said, unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him Which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus. When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” Once more. At the commencement of the same apostle’s first epistle to the Corinthians, complaining of their schisms, he declares that he had baptized very few persons, “Lest any should say that I had baptized in mine own name.” And just before he had inquired, “were ye baptized in the name of Paul?” as if he said, “remember the Name in which ye were baptized:”—and what other could that have been, than “in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost?”

S. Justin in his first apology describes how baptism, in his day, was performed: and after some other particulars, thus continues: “super eo qui regenerari voluerit, et peccatorum pœnitentiam egerit, parentis omnium et Domini Dei nomen pronuntiatur.—Sed et in nomine Jesu Christi sub Pontio Pilato crucifixi, et in nomine Spiritus Sancti, qui per prophetas omnia ad Jesum spectantia prænuntiavit, is qui illuminatur, abluitur.”<sup>9</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup> Opera. p. 80.

“The ancient author of the *Recognitions* of S. Clement,” as he is styled by Bingham who cites the passage, thus speaks of baptism: “ideo accelerate: est enim in aquis istis, misericordiæ vis quædam; quæ ex initio ferebatur super eas, et agnoscit eos qui baptizantur sub appellatione triplicis sacramenti, et eripit eos de suppliciis futuris.” Also, the same author, in a place already quoted from the third book; “baptizabitur autem unusquisque vestrum in aquis perennibus, nomine trinæ beatitudinis invocato super se, etc.”<sup>10</sup>

Tertullian’s tract “de baptismo,” is naturally referred to by almost every writer on this subject. But, before we come to the chief place in it, relating to the form of words, I would remark, that in the beginning he is arguing against those who, because the rites of this sacrament are few and simple, refuse to believe in the great blessings promised in the observance of it. I shall therefore extract the entire sentence, although a part of it only bears on our immediate subject. “Nihil adeo est quod tam obduret mentes hominum, quam simplicitas divinorum operum quæ in actu videtur, et magnificentia quæ in effectu repromittitur: ut hic quoque quoniam tanta simplicitate, sine pompa, sine apparatu novo aliquo, denique sine sumptu, homo in aqua demissus, et inter pauca verba tinctus non multo vel nihilo mundior resurgit, eo incredibilis existimetur consecutio æternitatis.” Here, the *pauca verba*

---

<sup>10</sup> *Lib. vj. §. 9. lib. iij. §. 67. Cotelerius. tom. 1.*

must refer to the short form, which presently afterwards the writer makes plain mention of: "Lex enim tinguenti imposita est, et forma præscripta. Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tingentes eas in nomen Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." And again, in his book against Praxeas, he declares that our Lord commanded all men to be baptized, "in Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum, non in unum."<sup>11</sup>

S. Cyprian states the proper form, and traces it up to the commission given to the disciples. "Dominus enim post resurrectionem discipulos suos mittens quemadmodum baptizare deberent instruxit et docuit dicens: *Data est mihi omnis potestas in cælo et in terra. Ite ergo et docete gentes omnes baptizantes eos in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti.* Insinuat Trinitatem, cujus sacramento gentes baptizarentur."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Opera. pp. 224. 229. 516. See also his contemporary S. Hippolytus, (against Noetus): by whom the form is cited in proof of the Personality of the Trinity in Unity. cap. xiv. Routh. *Opuscula*. p. 66.

<sup>12</sup> Opera. p. 131. The controversy between Stephen, bishop of Rome, and S. Cyprian, with respect to rebaptization, and the opinion of each, are well known. It has been said that they, who, at that time and afterwards, agreed with pope Stephen, did not distinguish between any of the baptisms said to have been conferred

by heretics. Upon this it is well to quote some remarks of the learned editors of S. Ambrose, attached to his treatise *de Mysteriis*. cap. iv. "Quod vero ad Stephani opinionem, exstiterunt nostra memoria, qui contra placita veterum eum in quibuslibet ab hæresi redeuntibus, licet in Trinitatis nomine non baptizatis, iterari baptismata vetuisse disputarent. Illorum momentum præcipuum est decretum ipsius Stephani à Cypriano contra ejusdem epistolam relatum, scilicet, *si quis ergo à quacumque hæresi venerit ad nos, nihil innovetur*, etc. Item

I shall add two more authorities : first, S. Ambrose, He tells us ; “ Credit catechumenus in crucem Domini Jesu, qua et ipse signatur : sed nisi baptizatus fuerit in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, remissionem non potest accipere peccatorum, nec spiritualis gratiæ munus haurire.”<sup>13</sup> And S. Augustin, in his sixth book on baptism, against the Donatists : “ certa sunt illa evangelica verba, sine quibus non potest baptismus consecrari :” and again in the same

Augustini locus in lib. *de unico bapt.* cap. 14. ita loquentis : *Stephanus baptismum hæreticorum in nullo iterandum esse censebat.* Verum forte an non satis advertere amborum verba ex usu qui per ea tempora vigeat, intelligenda ; sicut Eusebius *lib. 7. cap. iij.* et Vincentius Lerin. *comm. l. cap. xix.* satis indicant : hæreticos autem rebaptizari ex traditione fere communi eos solos moris fuisse, qui tincti sub Trinitatis invocatione non fuerant ; ut constat auctoritate non modo laudatorum auctorum, sed etiam Augustini passim contra Donatistas, Optati Milev. Facundi, atque aliorum. Et sane Leo Magnus eamdem criminationem non effugeret, nisi simili modo accipietur id quod ait epist. 89. ad Nicetam ; *Qui baptismum ab hæreticis acceperunt, sola S. Spiritus invocatione per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt :* illic enim nulla hæreticorum distinctio ex-

primitur. Attamen multo etiam probabilius est conditionem illam, modo baptismum in nomine Trinitatis collatum fuerit, à Stephano exaratam esse in sua epistola. Quid enim aliud sibi voluit Firmilianus dum ita scripsit : *Illud quoque absurdum, quo non putant quærendum esse, quis sit ille qui baptizaverit ; eo quod qui baptizatus sit, gratiam consequi potuerit invocata Trinitate nominum Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti ?* Idem quoque post narratam dæmoniacæ cujusdam feminæ historiam subdit : *Quid igitur de hujusce baptismi dicemus—maxime cui nec symbolum defuit Trinitatis, etc.*” Opera S. Ambros. *tom. 2. p. 329.*

The student should read the epistle of Firmilian ; it is reprinted in the very useful collection by Dr. Routh. *Opuscula. tom. 1. p. 221.*

<sup>13</sup> Opera. *tom. 2. p. 330.*



section, he repeats: "Deus adest evangelicis verbis suis, sine quibus baptismus Christi consecrari non potest."<sup>14</sup>

Yet I must not pass on, without mentioning the very important canon (the nineteenth) of the council of Nice. It is directed against the Paulianists, and lays persons, returning from that heresy to the Church, under several disabilities. It begins, to our present purpose, "Concerning the Paulianists, who have come over to the Catholic Church, the decision is, that they must by all means be baptized again." It is admitted upon all hands, that the reason for this order was, because the Paulianists denied the doctrine of the Trinity, and baptized under an improper form. If I am not mistaken, neither Balsamon nor Zonaras allude to this part of the canon, their gloss being chiefly taken up with the question of the Paulianist clergy: but Beverege, after an accurate disquisition on the exact heresy which was taught by that sect, proceeds thus: "— primo tenendum est, Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum à mortuis suscitatum, priusquam ad Patrem suum ascenderet, in mandatis dedisse, ut ad Christianam religionem conversi in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti baptizarentur. Hinc Catholica Ecclesia, idque summo quidem jure, perpetuo consentit, baptismum nemini rite collatum esse, nisi juxta Do-

---

<sup>14</sup> Opera. tom. ix. p. 176.— Compare the 3rd book of the same work: cap. xv. in which S. Augustin explains that the "Evan-

gelica verba" are "in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti." *Ibid.* p. 115.

mini institutionem, ‘*in nomine*, etc,’ celebratus fuerit. —Hinc igitur est, quod patres hi Nicæni Catharos quidem ad Ecclesiam accedentes baptizari non præcipiant, can. 8. quippe qui antea, ‘*in nomine Patris* etc,’ baptizati fuerint.” The canon reads, “*αναβαπτιζεσθαι αυτους.*” The very learned annotator observes: “*Вox αναβαπτιζεσθαι hic καταχρηστικως usurpatur, non secus ac vox καθαιρεισθαι, paulo post.*<sup>15</sup>—Qui enim a Paulianistis baptizantur, ab iis pro vere baptizatis existimantur: ab iis inquam, sed non item à catholicis: qui proinde eos *αναβαπτιζεσθαι* jubent; tametsi antea non fuerant proprie baptizati.—Ex eo autem, quod Novatianos baptizari non præcipiant, sed tantum Paulianistas, palam est, sanctos hosce patres, neminem ad Ecclesiam conversum baptizari voluisse, nisi qui antea vere, hoc est, ‘*in nomine Patris*, etc,’ non baptizatus est.”<sup>16</sup>

But whilst it is essential, according to the united testimony of the churches both of the East and West, (whether derived from their rituals or from the teaching of their greatest doctors,) that baptism, in order that it should be valid, must be administered by a form of words, in which there is a plain mention made of the Three Persons of the Ever-Blessed Trinity, so it would appear to be also if not necessary, at least, of the highest moment, that the person to be baptized,

<sup>15</sup> See the canon; and the gloss of Balsamon and Zonaras: *Bevereg. Pandect. tom. 1. p. 82.*

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid. tom. 2. Annot. p. 86.* Compare Routh, *Opuscula. p. 443.*

the person baptizing, and the act itself of baptism, are to be also specified. Merely to say "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," would, by itself, explain nothing, signify nothing: if those words were also accompanied with the action of casting water upon the one person by the other pronouncing them, it might be supposed to mean that baptism, in its ecclesiastical sense, was being performed; but then, also, both the agent and the recipient, if no others, must understand and acknowledge that the sacrament is to be, and is being, conferred. So that, without longer delaying upon this, it must be allowed, as I have already said, to be, at least, of the very highest moment, that some open declaration to that effect should be used as in the Eastern Church, "βαπτίζεται ὁ δούλος τοῦ Θεοῦ:" or, as in the West, "I baptize thee;" "baptizo te."

If, therefore, in reply to the questions already alluded to, which, by the rubric of our present ritual, the minister is enjoined to put to those who bring to him a child said to have been privately baptized, he finds that it is either certain that no such declaration was made, or uncertain that it was so made; or, that the persons then present can testify nothing more than that water was poured upon the child, "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost;" he would not, perhaps, be exceeding the due limits within which he has to exercise his judgment, if he rejects such an administration of baptism as invalid; certainly, he would not be justified in pronouncing it

to be complete, and in omitting to use the hypothetical form.

This brings to our consideration the two forms which have been the most widely adopted : the one, declaring the person who administers, " I baptize thee : " the other, stating the mere fact, " this person is baptized. "

It is not a matter to be surprised at, that we find there have been, in the Greek church upon the one side, and in the Latin upon the other, supporters of each of these forms so staunch and positive, as to argue that it is the only legitimate and valid one.<sup>17</sup> But, even

<sup>17</sup> As regards the extent to which the objections of the Greeks reached, it may be well to quote the 4th canon of the council of Lateran, in 1215 : where, amongst other complaints and abuses to be corrected in the Greek church, then returning as it was said to the Latin obedience, was this : " baptizatos etiam a Latinis et ipsi Græci rebaptizare ausu temerario præsumebant : et adhuc, sicut accepimus, quidam agere hoc non verentur. " Concil. Mansi. tom. xxij. p. 990. It is difficult to conjecture upon what ground such a practice could have been made to rest, except the objection mentioned in the text. The canon states the fact, but suggests no reason for it. See also, *Decretal. lib. 3. tit. 42. c. 6.* and Raynald. *ad an. 1351. n. xx. 1354. n. xxvj.*

consent that this was indeed the ground of objection : he declares that it is impossible the Greeks could have been so stupid—" tam stupidos fuisse, "—as not to have perceived the use of either an active or a passive verb to be indifferent. Hence, he supposes that they doubted the validity of Latin baptisms, because they incorrectly believed that they were administered with one immersion only. *Concordia Eccles. lib. 1. p. 17.* But the objection did probably rest (as I have said) solely on the use of the word " baptizo ; " because such was the expressed argument of some of the Greek writers. But whatever it was,—whether the one or the other, or both,—the practice of rebaptizing was not long persisted in by the Greeks ; nor probably at any time, except by a few, and those the

if there were not sufficiently plain and decided conclusions upon this point, it is evident that, in fact, both statements amount to the same thing. In the Western church it is expressly said, and undoubtedly it is the simpler and better form, "I baptize thee:" in the Greek, "This person is baptized;" but in this last there must be necessarily understood the words "by me;" according to the injunctions of the rubric in that ritual. For, it is the minister who is directed to baptize; and it is the same minister who is to say the appointed form.

The deliberate opinion, in the middle ages, of the doctors of the Western church is summed up in the famous decree of pope Eugenius, directed to the Armenians, after the council of Florence, in the year 1439. The sacraments in succession are treated of and explained, according to the doctrine then held by all churches in communion with the church of Rome: and upon baptism, *primum omnium sacramentorum*, it is declared; "— *materia hujus sacramenti est aqua vera et naturalis; nec refert, frigida sit an calida. Forma autem est; Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Non tamen negamus, quin per et illa verba, Baptizatur talis servus Christi in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti; vel, Baptizatur manibus meis talis, in nomine etc. verum perficiatur baptisma: quoniam cum principalis causa, ex*

---

most violent against the particular doctrines insisted on in the West-

ern church, and which had unhappily led to the great schism.



qua baptismus virtutem habet, sit sancta Trinitas, instrumentalis autem sit minister qui tradit exterius sacramentum, si exprimitur actus, qui per ipsum exercetur ministrum, cum Sanctæ Trinitatis invocatione, perficitur sacramentum.”<sup>18</sup>

It has indeed been said, that very anciently in the Western church also another form than “Ego baptizo te” was used. But there is not a shadow of proof for such an assertion. The utmost which can be offered amounts solely to this: that for the first four centuries, it is not distinctly stated by any writer, or in any document, that the declaration “I baptize thee” was made at baptisms. But it is undeniable, that there is nowhere any testimony whatever that it was not made.

Besides: it is of no little weight, that so far as we have evidence of the use of these words, in the works of the earliest writers who speak of them, it is mentioned not as a new introduction or addition to the form, but as of acknowledged and well-known antiquity. Nor are we to forget that in the sacramentary of S. Gregory, and in the Gallican ritual edited by Thomasius, we find the use of this declaration enjoined.

As to the earlier sacramentaries of S. Leo, and S. Gelasius, it is true that according to the text of some

---

<sup>18</sup> Concilia. tom. xxxi. col. 1055. Patrum. tom. 26. p. 577. And Compare Gennadius, *Expos. pro* Bessarion, *de sacr. Euch.* ibid. *conc. Florent. cap. 2. §. vj.* Bibl. p. 794.

manuscripts, this declaration is not to be found: but neither is there the remainder of the form, "in nomine, *etc.*" This is very observable in the Gelasian sacramentary: as the reader will perceive by referring to the edition by Thomasius.<sup>19</sup> All who are accustomed to the study of the most ancient Service Books, and who know how brief the directions are which they generally contain, will not be inclined to lay stress on this omission. Besides, (and it is a most important fact) there are other manuscripts of the Gelasian sacramentary extant, in which the declaration in question is appointed. Martene gives two, where it occurs in the office for the baptism of the sick.<sup>20</sup>

But to return to the Gregorian and Gallican rituals. For the first of these, as it is edited by Menard: after the interrogations it proceeds: "— *et dicit*; Et ego baptizo te in nomine, *etc.*"<sup>21</sup> For the other, we find; "*Dum baptizas interrogas ei, et dicis*: Baptizo te, *ill.* in nomine, *etc.*"<sup>22</sup> With respect to the variation "Baptizo," instead of "Ego baptizo," it is of the least possible consequence; and, indeed, some manuscripts of the Gregorian sacramentary read "Baptizo."<sup>23</sup>

<sup>19</sup> *Opera. tom. 6. p. 75.* See also Muratori, *Liturgia Rom. Vetus. p. 570.*

<sup>20</sup> *De ant. ecc. rit. tom. 1. p. 66.*

<sup>21</sup> *Opera. tom. 3. p. 73.* Compare the edition of this sacramentary by Pamelius; which gives an important variation, as to single

or trine immersion. *tom. 2. p. 269.*

<sup>22</sup> Thomasius. *Opera. tom. 6. p. 290.*

<sup>23</sup> See Menard's note. 323. *p. 352.*

"An vero hæc vocabula, *ego baptizo te*, spectent ad necessitatem formæ hujus sacramenti, an

I do not think it necessary to produce the evidence of succeeding rituals: it may be affirmed that they are but copies of the sacramentary of S. Gregory; this, broadly stated, is not correct; but whether it is so or not, it must be said that, with one consent, they agree in the use of the same declaration. They may be referred to in the collections of Martene, and Mabillon: and with them should be compared the concurrent testimony of the ancient ritualists, Alcuin, Amalarius, and others: whose books are published in the Auctarium to the Bibl. Patrum, and in the collection by Hittorpius.

Several centuries before the pontificate of S. Gregory, there is a circumstance recorded in the Acts of S. Stephen, bishop of Rome, in the third century, which supports the conclusion to which we should naturally come, that this declaration, "Baptizo" or "Ego baptizo," had always been made in the Western

---

invocatio sola personarum sanctissimæ Trinitatis ad validitatem hujus sacramenti sufficiat, dicendo tantum, *In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, disputat Stephanus Tornacensis epist. 5. Cum enim quidam vir diœcesis Claromontanæ inopia sacerdotis filium suum *undejasset* [ut ipse loquitur] eumque immergendo his verbis omissis, *ego baptizo te*, dixisset tantum, *in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, hæc rescians Petrus Claromontanus

episcopus consuluit venerabilem Mauricium Parisiorum episcopum; qui ut respondit, nullum esse ejusmodi baptismum, non contentus Petrus scripsit Stephano Tornacensi episcopo, qui rescripsit ejusmodi formam esse sufficientem, et ejusmodi verba, *ego baptizo te*, non spectare ad essentiam formæ baptismalis; ac proinde ejusmodi baptisma validum fuisse; hocque nervis omnibus probare nititur. Hæc tamen opinio theologorum scholæ adversatur." *Ibid.*

church. S. Stephen is said to have baptized a Roman soldier and his daughter : “Cum diei hora appropinquasset vespertina, fontem benedixit, et deponens Nemesium in aquam dixit; ‘In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, baptizo te.’ Et ad filiam Nemesii conversus, ‘Credis,’ ait, *etc.*”<sup>24</sup> The manner in which this circumstance is related, as regards the fact for which I have referred to it, serves to supply testimony in favour of its truth.

This case of the baptism administered by pope Stephen is appealed to by Tournely; who has the following remark, much to the purpose. “Non obstat penuria testimoniorum ante sextum sæculum: his quippe primis temporibus, propter frequentiam hæreticorum adulterantium invocationem personarum SS. Trinitatis absolute necessariam, magis attenti erant et solliciti veteres in demonstranda necessitate illius invocationis, quam in commemorando verbo quo utebantur ut exprimerent actum baptizantis.”<sup>25</sup>

The real question involved in this inquiry is, not whether it is necessary that the person baptizing should be especially named, as in our form, *I baptize*, and in the Latin *Ego baptizo*, or, *baptizo*; but, whe-

<sup>24</sup> Baronius. *Annal. ad an.* 259. xxij. These Acts of S. Stephen, I need not remind the reader, have been rejected by some as spurious. Whatever the actual date of the compiling them may be, they are grounded, doubt-

less, upon known traditional facts, and are of high antiquity. Baronius himself considers them to be genuine. “Extant quoque ejus passionis acta, quæ visa sunt nobis fidelissima.” *Ibid.* xx.

<sup>25</sup> De baptismo. p. 93.

ther the act itself, which is being performed, should be plainly expressed and stated. Because although, by an unavoidable inference, the Greek ritual must be understood to mean, (as I have before observed) the same with our own and the Latin, that is, “[by me] *this person is baptized*,” yet the appointed form does not distinctly demonstrate it. It is important to remember that the schoolmen and canonists of the middle ages appear to have believed that the form used in the Greek church was optative, not indicative; “*baptizetur*” not “*baptizatur*:”<sup>26</sup> which, it will be at once evident, opens up a very different and perhaps a reasonable difficulty. Yet, even under that view, their opinion was sufficiently unanimous.

The following extract from Antoninus explains the conclusion to which they came. “*Expressio personæ baptizantis non est de necessitate sacramenti, sed de præcepto ecclesiæ secundum formam Latinorum: et hoc probatur ex eo, quod Græci conferunt verum baptismum, et tamen non exprimunt in forma personam baptizantem, dicentes sic: baptizetur servus Dei [tal]is in nomine Patris, etc. Causa autem, quare non exprimunt personam baptizantem, est error, qui ponitur Cor. 1. quia quidam attribuebant ministris baptis-*

---

<sup>26</sup> “Græci quidem baptizant sub hac forma: *baptizetur servus Christi in nomine Patris*, etc. et tamen vere baptizant.” Pupilla oculi. *Pars. 2. cap. iij. C.* “Non

autem dicunt Græci *baptizetur*, ut plerique Latinorum existimant;” is the observation of Arcudius. *Concordia Eccles. lib. 1. cap. viij.*



mum.<sup>27</sup> Convenientior tamen est forma nostra, ut dicit Thomas, quia exprimit non solum causam efficientem principalem baptismi, scilicet invocationem Trinitatis, sed etiam causam instrumentalem, dum dicit minister, *baptizo*; sub quo intelligitur *ego*, etiam si non diceretur. Sed dimitti non debet, quia sic statuit ecclesia dicendum. *Amen* non est de præcepto Ecclesiæ, sed de more quarundam ecclesiarum, non universali: et ideo ubi est de more, dici debet: quod ad confirmationem totius est, non de necessitate sacramenti.<sup>28</sup>

<sup>27</sup> Compare Arcudius, in the chapter just cited.

<sup>28</sup> Summa. tit. 14. cap. xiiij. §. 2. cit. Trombelli, *Dissert.* 10. xxvij.

And I would add also the objection and the answer as they are in the Summa of Aquinas.

“Videtur, quod hæc non sit conveniens forma baptismi: *Ego te baptizo in nomine*, etc. Actus enim magis debet attribui principali agenti, quam ministro: sed in sacramento minister agit, ut instrumentum: principale autem agens in baptismo est Christus, secundum illud Joan. 1. *Super quem videris Spiritum descendentem, et manentem, hic est, qui baptizat*: inconvenienter ergo minister dicit, *Ego te baptizo*: præsertim, quia in hoc, quod dicitur, *baptizo*, intelligitur ego, et sic videtur superflue ap-

poni.—¶ Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod actio attribuitur instrumento, sicut immediate agenti: attribuitur autem hujusmodi actio principali agenti, sicut in cujus virtute instrumentum agit: et ideo in forma baptismi convenienter significatur minister ut exercens actum baptismi, per hoc, quod dicitur; *Ego te baptizo*, sicut et ipse Dominus baptizandi actum attribuit ministris dicens; *Baptizantes eos*, etc. Causa autem principalis significatur, ut in cujus virtute sacramentum agitur, per hoc, quod dicitur: *In nomine*, etc. non enim Christus baptizat sine Patre, et Spiritu Sancto. Græci autem non attribuunt actum baptismi ministris, ad evitandum antiquorum errorem, qui virtutem baptismi baptizantibus attribuebant, dicentes; *Ego sum Pauli, et ego Cephæ*: et ideo

It is yet to be remarked that some of the schoolmen held, as did Stephen bishop of Tournay, in the 12th century,<sup>29</sup> that baptism administered with these words only, "In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," is true and valid. In order to meet this variety of opinion, small as in comparison the number of its supporters was, Morinus has a somewhat curious argument. Rather than admit that such writers as Hugo S. Victor and Peter Lombard could err on the matter, he proposes a solution of the difficulty, which we cannot admit, who believe that the validity of the sacrament, as regards its essentials, must depend upon the same particulars at all times: that, once instituted by our Blessed Lord, it cannot be changed or altered in any necessary detail whatsoever, by any authority less than His. And this, whether by addition or by diminution.

Morinus supposes that before the famous decision of pope Alexander III. was made generally known, baptisms administered under the form only "In the Name, *etc.*" would be true; but not so, after that decision had been published; and that the earlier and the later schoolmen are thus, though teaching contrary doctrines, nevertheless both correct. For he

---

dicunt, *baptizetur servus Christi, talis, in nomine*, etc. Et quia exprimitur actus exercitus per ministrum cum invocatione Trinitatis, verum perficitur sacramentum: quod autem additur, *Ego*

in forma nostra, non est de substantia formæ, sed ponitur ad majorem expressionem intentionis.' *Pars. III. quæst. 66. art. v.*

<sup>29</sup> See above: note 23.

continues; “Nec istorum doctorum sententiæ officit Alexander: concesso enim Alexandrum hoc non docuisse ut doctor particularis, potuit decernere ut sacramentum hoc ritu antea valide celebratum, in posterum non valeret, apud eos scilicet ad quos decretum pervenisset.”<sup>30</sup>

The decision of pope Alexander is in the third book of the Decretals.<sup>31</sup> “Si quis puerum ter in aqua immerserit, ‘*in nomine Patris* etc.’ et non dixerit, ‘*Ego baptizo te in nomine Patris* etc.’ non est puer baptizatus.” The margin refers to various glosses upon this canon, which agree that the interpretation to be put upon it must not be so strict, as to exclude baptisms conferred with words equivalent to “baptizo.” Indeed the very wording of the canon itself makes it plain, that the author of it was directing his attention solely to the question, whether the act then being performed, and the person to be baptized, were necessarily to be expressed. This will be evident to any one who considers the way in which “Amen” is introduced into the first clause, and omitted in the second.<sup>32</sup>

<sup>30</sup> De pœnit. *lib. viij. cap. xvj.*  
§. 21. Compare Van Espen. *Jus.*  
*Eccles. Pars. II. §. 1. tit. ij.*

<sup>31</sup> *Tit. xlij. cap. 1.*

<sup>32</sup> I would notice another difficulty which was much discussed by the canonists and schoolmen. Vossius sums up the matter in a few words. “Video, a scholasticis

etiam quæstionem moveri, utrum, in uno baptizando, duo possint concurrere: ut si, in gravi persecutione (qualis illa Diocletiani, item Vandalica, et similes) duorum presbyterorum uni sit evulsa lingua; alteri sint amputata brachia: eoque, qui brachium habet, tingat silens; qui elinguis non est,

The remarks already made upon the words "I baptize" will apply equally to the word which follows, specifying and identifying the subject. "I baptize thee." All rituals which prescribe the words, or their equivalents, "I baptize," add also some term indicating the person to be baptized. I shall content myself, upon this point, with extracting the observation of a very learned writer; "*tale indicium, seu, ut aiunt scholastici, talis expressio requiritur, ut denotetur in forma distinctio inter baptizantem, et baptizatum: siquidem nemo se ipsum baptizare potest. Itaque, ne verbum baptizo indefinitum maneat, et quasi indifferens ad eandem, vel diversam personam, explicari, indicarique, et veluti demonstrari debet persona baptizati. Hinc Græci quoque personam indicant, tametsi non eadem voce, sed prorsus æquivalenti, dum sic aiunt: baptizatur servus Christi, etc.*"<sup>33</sup>

formulam baptismi proferat. Negat Aureolus iv. *sent. dist. v. q. 1.* legitimum esse baptismum.—Sed dissentit Paludanus *distin.* eadem: ubi pro vero baptismo agnoscit. Equidem non dubito, quin, ubi aliis committi possit baptismus, ab iis potius sit poscendus: verum, si tam atrox fuerit persecutio, ut presbyterorum alii, vel sint sublati, vel fugati; dixerò, non duorum hunc fore baptismum, sed potius unius: quia is qui loquitur lingua sua, manu tingit aliena, sed vicaria; eòque duo illi unum repræsentant hominem, sed integrum." *De*

*bapt. disp. x. thes. 14.*

The reader will observe that the consideration of such doubts and questions as the above, regarding the due and valid administration of this sacrament, is of value, not so much for the cases themselves in doubt, (which may be next almost to impossibility of occurrence) but in their bearing upon the main principles which are involved in them. Hence they are not superciliously to be disregarded as either trivial or absurd.

<sup>33</sup> Trombelli. *tom. 4. p. 481.*  
" Si subtrahatur aliquid, quod sit

I am not disposed to enter at any length into the consideration of the many difficulties, which canonists and schoolmen have proposed, in cases where additions and changes in the form have been made. It is well known that, especially in the Eastern churches, short sentences are added at the end of it; or even, introduced between the pronunciation of the Name of each Divine Person. Thus, in the Greek church, there is the addition; “Νυν και αι, και εις τους αιωνας των αιωνων. Αμην.”<sup>34</sup> The ritual of the Coptic and Ethiopic churches interpolates the declaration “I baptize thee,” and the conclusion, “Amen,” between the mention of each of the Three Persons.<sup>35</sup> Again, the Syriac ritual has the following form: “Baptizatur talis in sanctitatem, et in salutem, et in mores irreprehensibiles, et in benedictam resurrectionem à mortuis, in nomine Patris. Amen. Et Filii. Amen. Et Spiritus Vivi et Sancti in vitam sæculi sæculorum. Amen.”<sup>36</sup> With regard

---

de essentia formæ, certum est quod non est baptismus: et ille qui baptizat, graviter peccat.— Similiter expressio personæ baptizatæ est de substantia formæ: quia per eam determinatur actus ad hunc baptismum: et ideo si subtrahatur, non erit baptismus.” Thom. Aquin. *in iv. senten. dis. III. art. 2. sol. iij. cit. ibid.*

<sup>34</sup> Goar. *Rituale Græc. p. 355.*

<sup>35</sup> Asseman. *Codex. Lit. tom. 2. p. 180.* In the Chaldee and

Malabar ritual, the *response* “Amen” is appointed between each clause of the form.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid. p. 236.* The Maronite ritual appoints: “Ego te baptizo. *N.* agnum in nomine Patris, *etc.*” *p. 350.*

Examples occur in the ancient western sacramentaries, as in the manuscript of the 8th century, published by Mabillon: “Baptizo te, *etc.* et Spiritus Sancti, unam habentem substantiam, ut habeas vitam æternam, partem cum sanc-



to all such additions,—resting upon the authority of each particular church, and neither militating against the right doctrine of the Blessed Trinity, nor omitting any essential particular of the shorter form;—it is generally held that they do not so affect baptisms administered with them, as to render them invalid or doubtful. They are not to be desired, because they interfere with the plain simplicity of the form appointed by our Lord: on the other hand, they are to be looked upon as merely exegetical, and intended (although, it may be, injudiciously) to explain the power, and object, and effect of baptism.

But a far more difficult question is involved in those cases, where instead of the usual form, “in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” some other terms, certainly, so to speak, applicable to and distinctive of the Three Divine Persons, happen (whether from design or ignorance) to have been used. As, for example: “in the Name of the Unbegotten, of the Begotten, and of Him Proceeding from the Unbegotten, and the Begotten.” Or, “in the Name

---

tis.” *Mus. Ital. tom. 1. p. 324.* Again, in the “*Missale Gallicanum vetus*” edited by Thomasius: “*Baptizo te credentem in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti: ut habeas vitam æternam in sæcula sæculorum.*” *Opera. tom. vj. p. 402.* There is an ambiguity in this last, which at once exposes it to very serious objections.

The liturgical student will possibly recognize here, also, another link in the chain of evidence which may be brought to prove the eastern origin of the Gallic and British churches. This is a very important inquiry. I would refer to a note upon the subject in my work on the *Ancient Liturgy of the Church of England. p. lj. 79.*

of the Father, and of Jesus Christ, and of the Comforter."

Now, with regard to this last,—and on such a subject, I am very anxious to propose as few specific variations as may be, sufficient only to explain wherein the difficulty consists, and to direct the student in his further search,—it is to be remembered, that according to the Apostolical constitutions it was permitted, if not enjoined, that the form should be "in the Name of the Father, of Christ, and of the Comforter." This, at least, has been said to have been so, though the constitution is very far from plain to this purpose.<sup>37</sup>

The doctrine of the schoolmen, and it is a point in which they did not fail largely to exercise themselves, may be said to have been almost unanimous against the lawfulness of any such alteration in the form, which was appointed by our Lord. Vasquez, a late writer, sums up their decisions, declaring that, according to the common and correct opinion held in the schools, invocation of the Three Divine Persons by their Names,—the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost,—is so necessary, that the introduction of other names,

---

<sup>37</sup> The doubt rests on the manner in which our Lord's command is introduced into the text. "Περι δε βαπτισματος, ω επισκοπε, η πρεσβυτερε, ηδη μεν και προτερον διεταξαμεθα· και νυν δε φαμεν, οτι ουτω βαπτισεις, ως ο κυριος διεταξατο ημιν, λεγων· Πορευθεντες μαθητευσατε παντα τα εθνη·

βαπτιζοντες αυτους εις το ονομα του πατρος, και του υιου, και του αγιου πνευματος· διδασκοντες αυτους τηρειν παντα οσα ενετειλαμην υμιν· του αποστειλαντος πατρος· του ελθοντος Χριστον· του μαρτυρησαντος παρακλητου." *lib.* 7. *cap.* xxij.

in their stead, supposed to be equivalent, or equipollent, would invalidate the Sacrament.<sup>38</sup> Great, however, as the balance of authority is, in favour of this sentence, it is not undisputed: and in order that the reader may have the objection to it, in the words of its most learned supporter, I shall lay before him (though somewhat long) the following extract from the Summa of Aquinas, and the explanation given by his annotator, cardinal Cajetan.

But a few previous remarks will serve to the better understanding of the argument. The terms, concerning the propriety of which the schoolmen have chiefly disputed, are “ Genitor ;” “ Genitus ;” and “ Spiratus ;” or, “ Procedens.” They teach that these are not, as are “ Pater ;” “ Filius ;” and “ Spiritus Sanctus,” *nomina principalia*, but *minus principalia*; “ quia significant personas, non sub ratione proprietatum, sed originum.” If, however, we would preserve the essence of the sacrament of baptism, it is not enough that we express the Names of the Persons of the Blessed Trinity by equivalents, but it must be by synonyms. An equivalent name is that which signifies the same thing, although for a different reason: as, in speaking of our Lord, we may say, the Word, or, the Son.

Again; “ Father,” “ Son,” and “ Holy Ghost” are, as it will be seen Aquinas argued, the names of Persons: but this is not true of “ Genitor,” “ Genitus,” and “ Procedens;” which, to use the words of the

---

<sup>38</sup> *Disp. 144. cap. 2. n. 3.*

schoolmen, are “nomina notionum, seu personarum sub ratione notionum.” Now, it is necessary that these Three Divine Persons should be known to, and believed in, by every faithful member of the Church: which may well be, as They are signified by the names of Father; Son; and Holy Ghost. Not so, under the other names; which can be known and acknowledged not by all men, learned and unlearned, but only by those who are doctors and theologians. Because, therefore, the form in baptism contains not only an invocation of the Blessed Trinity, but a confession of faith, so it is necessary that it should be so worded, as to be understood by all the faithful: in short, it ought to be a plain statement of the deep mystery made known to us by our Lord, and not an exposition of theological subtilties.<sup>39</sup>

We proceed now to the *Summa*. The question is, “Utrum hæc sit conveniens forma baptismi: Ego te

<sup>39</sup> “Neque obstat, quod minister proferat verba formæ in lingua, quam baptizatus non novit: nam cum solius ministri sit, tunc pro forma tres personas, ut authorem sacramenti invocare, satis est, si ipse in hac, aut illa lingua invocet, cum recipiens sacramentum non debeat simul cum illo idem mysterium tunc profiteri, sed ipse solum minister ore proferre eo modo, quo catechumenus credere, et confiteri debuit, antequam ad baptismum accederet: hoc autem solum

fit per illa verba, *Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, quia per hæc in lingua latina, vel per alia ejusmodi in alia lingua, fideles omnes, qui ad baptismum accedunt, tres personas sub his nominibus, et conceptibus nosse, et confiteri debent.” Vasquez. *disp.* 144. c. 2. n. 9. This is an argument, whatever its weight may be, necessary to be, at least, urged in defence of the constant use of a form in a dead language.

baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti?" To which the seventh objection and its answer are thus stated. "¶ Præterea. Persona Patris non solum significatur nomine Patris, sed etiam nomine innascibilis, et genitoris: Filius autem significatur nomine verbi, et imaginis, et geniti. Spiritus etiam Sanctus potest significari nomine doni, et amoris procedentis; ergo videtur, quod etiam his nominibus utendo perficiatur baptismus. — Ad septimum dicendum, quod, sicut aqua sumitur ad baptismum, quia ejus usus est communior ad abluendum, ita ad significandum tres personas in forma baptismi assumuntur illa nomina, quibus communius consueverunt nominari personæ in illa lingua, nec in aliis nominibus perficitur sacramentum."

To this Cajetan adds: "In responsione ad *septimum* dubium magnum occurrit circa ultima verba: *nec in aliis nominibus perficitur sacramentum*, an vera sint, ut sonant. — Ad hoc dicitur, quod licet hæc verba auctoris sonent, non esse verum baptismum, si dicatur, '*Ego te baptizo in nomine genitoris, et geniti, et procedentis ab utroque*,' et hoc idem sentiant Scotus, et Durand. in 3. dist. 4. sent. quia tamen hoc ex sacræ scripturæ auctoritate dependet, et durum videtur, ideo rationes eorum discutiendæ sunt. Maxima igitur ratio eorum est: quia Christus sic instituit, *Matt. ult.* 'Baptizantes, etc.' ex hoc enim infertur, ut in qualibet lingua nominibus significantibus Patrem, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum. Et notanter dicitur, *significantibus*, et non connotantibus, aut implicite insinuantibus. Et ratio



specialis horum nominum assignatur : quia significant ipsas personas divinas, alia vero nomina significant proprietates, aut actus aliquos earum. — Dicitur secundum dictorum opinionem doctorum, quod mutatio nominum, quoad significatum ex vi nominis, sive formale tantum, sive materiale tantum, sive utrumque, tollit veritatem baptismi. Ego autem considerans priscorum patrum dicta, ab his dissentio, motus ea ratione, quod identitas nominum quoad significatum *secundo* modo accipienda est in proposito, ut scilicet tunc solum sit variatio nominum quoad significatum, quando variatur significatum, ad quod ex accommodatione usus in forma sacramenti applicantur. Exempli causa ; cum dicitur in forma baptismi, *in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti* ; Pater ex accommodatione usus applicatur ad significandum primam personam Trinitatis, et similiter Filius ad significandum personam, quæ secunda est in Trinitate, et simile est de nomine Spiritus Sancti. Nam ex vi nominum nec omnia simul significant illas tres personas divinas, nec aliquod eorum significat aliquam personam divinam : quodlibet enim eorum ex vi nominis commune est multis, ut de se patet. Ex hoc itaque, et in hoc pendet tota quæstio, penes quid attendatur unitas, vel diversitas significati per nomen sacramentale. Attendentes enim ad communem rationem ejusdem, vel diversæ significationis nominum oportet consequenter dicere diversum esse significatum, quando formale, seu principale significatum ex vi nominis est diversum.

Perspicientes vero ad specialem usum nominum sacramentalium consequenter dicimus, tunc solum variari significatum, quando non significatur illud, ad quod ex accommodatione usus significandum applicatum est. Et propterea, si loco patris ponatur genitor, et loco filii ponatur genitus, quia eædem personæ significantur, non variatur significatio, quantumcumque sub alia, et alia ratione significantur personæ per hæc, et illa nomina.

“ ¶ Probatur autem sic debere accipi in proposito idem, vel diversum significatum, *primo* auctoritate sedis apostolicæ, de consecr. distinct. 4. cap. *a quodam*; ubi Nicolaus Papa reddens rationem, quare baptismus præceptus in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti valet in nomine Christi, dicit, *quia unum, et idem est proculdubio significatum*. Ex quo loco manifeste patet, identitatem significati per formam baptismi non attendi secundum communem nominum significationem, sed secundum id, ad quod significandum accommodata sunt nomina. Ad hoc enim aspiendo, idem significatur per Christum implicite, quod per Patrem, et Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum explicite.

“ ¶ *Secundo* auctoritate Ambrosii in 1. lib. *de Spiritu Sancto*, cap. 3. Ubi de forma baptismi loquens loco Filii ponit Christum, loco Patris ponit, a quo unctus est Christus, et loco Spiritus Sancti ponit, quo unctus est Christus. Ex qua doctrina clare habes, quod sufficit, personas divinas significare secundum Ambro-

sium ex actione; puta unctione; multo ergo magis sufficiet significare illas ex generatione.

“ ¶ *Tertio* ex auctoritate generalis concilii *Florentini* sub *Eugenio* IV. ubi institutionem Domini de forma baptismi interpretati sunt patres invocationem Trinitatis, et non limitaverunt se ad invocationem Trinitatis per hæc præcise nomina, *Pater, et Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus*: legimus enim ibi sic de forma baptismi: *Si exprimitur actus, qui per ipsum exercetur ministerium cum sanctæ Trinitatis invocatione, perficitur sacramentum.*

“ *Quarto* ex communi ecclesiæ confessione. Faten-  
tur enim omnes sanctam Trinitatem nos invocare, laudare, confiteri etiam in iudicio, non solum dictis nominibus utendo, sed etiam utendo æquipollentibus, puta genitore, omnipotente, genitoque ab ipso, et procedente ab utroque, dono, aut similibus.

“ ¶ *Quinto* ex acceptatis casibus. Nam, si quis diceret; *Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, Jesu Christi, et Spiritus Sancti*, procul dubio omnium sapientum iudicio perfectum esset sacramentum, ita, quod non esset locus reiterationi: et tamen constat, quod variatur significatum ex vi nominis, similiter, si quis diceret: *In nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus paracliti*; procul dubio eorundem iudicio verum esset baptisma, et tamen constat variari ex vi nominis significatum; unde Salvator instituens formam baptismi, *in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti*, non est intelligendus arctasse virtutem formæ ad formalia significata ex vi nominum

per hæc nomina: sed ad significata illa, ad quæ significanda hæc nomina accommodata sunt.”<sup>40</sup>

To proceed from the schoolmen to the canonists: those especially, at least, acknowledged and appealed to in the church of England. In the constitution already cited of archbishop Peckham, this is asserted; “*Forma sacramenti in vulgari lingua consistit non solum in signis, verumetiam in ordine eorundem verborum, quibus ipsum est divinitus sacramentum institutum.*” On this Lyndwood observes:

“*In ordine.* Unde transpositio ordinis verborum sacramentalium vitaret baptismum.—Et nota, secundum *Inno. et Hosti. extra. eo. ti. c. 1.* quod ordo ver-

<sup>40</sup> *Quæst. lxvi. art. 5.*

Cajetan continues in reply to an objection. “¶ Ad rationem autem illatam in oppositum: quia pater significat personam, genitor vero actum notionalem, facile respondetur satisfaciendo, *primo* falsum est, quod pater ex vi nominis significet personam, plusquam genitor: quoniam pater significat puram paternitatem in concreto: et similiter genitor puram generationem active in concreto: concretum autem utrobique est persona patris de Trinitate loquendo: quæ realiter, et formaliter ex parte rei identificatur et relationi paternitatis, et generationi activæ.

Dicitur *secundo*, quod manifeste constat, Spiritus Sancti no-

men nec proprietatem personalem nec actum notionalem, nec personam ex vi nominis significare, ut patet ex eo, quod tam Spiritus, quam sanctus, quam totum conjunctum, ex vi nominis dicitur de essentia divina: Spiritus enim est Deus, *etc.* Auctoris ergo verba, ut ad literam redeamus, quantum ex ratione literæ apparet, intelligenda sunt, quoad perfectionem præcepti, et non quoad perfectionem sacramenti absolute, ut sit sensus, quod in solis nominibus, quæ sunt in communiore usu, perficere tenemur sacramenta.” For replies to the arguments of Cajetan, see the commentary of Hiquæus on Scotus. *Sentent. lib. iv. tom. 8. p. 171.*

borum formæ baptismi sic servari debent, quod nec literaliter nec in vulgari licet aliquid interponere, vel antepondere, vel addere aliquid in ipsa forma, intendendo id esse de forma, nec formam esse sine ipso. Et quoad additionem, hoc intellige verum, quando addens credit illud additum esse de forma: si tamen ex simplicitate vel devotione aliquid addat, non dico diminuatur, vel ordinem præposteret, verus esset baptismus, etiamsi ex malitia vel hæresi adderet, dummodo non crederet illud additum esse de forma.

“*Eorundem verborum.* Unde loco hujus verbi, *baptizo*, non posset dici, *balneo*, vel *lavo*, vel *tingo*, secundum *Inno.* ut supra. Notat enim ibi inter cætera, quod licet hoc pronomen, *ego*, non sit de baptismi substantia; tamen hoc pronomen, *te*, est de substantia; *et concor. ibi Hosti. et Antonius.*”<sup>41</sup> With respect to this gloss of the canonist, it must be remarked that, if the text is correct, he is opposed to the majority in his judgement against the validity of a baptism conferred by a form in which “baptize” is not used, but some other word, in which the sense of ablution is conveyed.<sup>42</sup>

<sup>41</sup> *Lib. III. tit. 24.* Circa sacramentum.

“Item, discretio debet esse inter baptizantem et baptizatum; nam si baptizatis illum baptizabit; quia natura correlativorum hæc est, quod unum non sit aliud, ergo nullus seipsum baptizare potest: ad quod designandum Dominus non a seipso, sed a Jo-

anne voluit baptizari.” Hostiensis, in *Summa. lib. III. rubr. xliij. §. 6.*

<sup>42</sup> The word βαπτίζω is rendered by the Latin fathers by “tingo,” or “abluo:” see Tertullian, *adv. Praxeam, cap. 26.* S. Cyprian, *epist. 22. 25.* S. Jerome, in *cap. ult. Matt.* S. Isidore, *Orig. lib. vj. cap. 19. etc.*



Indeed it is strange that the constitution itself, upon which he is glossing, immediately after not merely recognizes the truth of such a baptism, but enjoins a form in the vulgar tongue (in cases of necessity) in which a term is employed, not strictly a synonym of "baptize." "Dicatur ergo a sic baptizantibus, 'I christen thee in the Name, etc.'"<sup>43</sup>

Such a change of meaning, however, as this last from "baptizo" to "I christen," should not, probably, be suffered except in cases where the form is, for the occasion only, used in the vulgar tongue; hence, the terms "Christifico," and "Christianum facio," which it is said some sects in Dalmatia introduced, are to be condemned. Somewhat like the old English vernacular, was the verb *Doopen* which was allowably admitted

The canonists and schoolmen doubt as to the allowance of the words "mergo," or "immergo." And they are unanimous in condemning such words as "mundo," "pergo," and the like.

<sup>43</sup> The common use of "christen" for "baptize" in English works of the middle ages is well known to every one who is at all conversant with writings of that date. The reader will find an example presently in an extract from the *Liber Festivalis*. Another is this in the old Form of the Greater Excommunication: "Clerkes seyn that a child byfore it be cristned, it hath a wikked

spirit dwelling in the soule. The wiche wikkede spirit is cast out thorough prayers of the prest, by fore the chirche dore whanne it shal be cristned: the wiche sacrament of bapteme is ground and begynnyng of all sacramentis, etc." Again, the rare tract, *Exornatorium curatorum*, (printed about 1508,) speaking of the sacraments; "The fyrste is baptyisme or crystendome, whiche putteth away orygynall synne."

Compare also the following from the very ancient Complaint of the Plowman. "Bed them go, and fullen all the folke in the Name of the Father, etc." *Foxe. Acts and Monuments, vol. 1. p. 524.*

on similar occasions, in the Low Countries.<sup>44</sup> It need perhaps scarcely be added, that as it is of necessity that the affusion or immersion should always be immediately after, or rather if possible simultaneous with, the pronunciation of the word "I baptize," much more ought it to be so when the minister, from what cause soever, uses another word, not strictly a synonym. This union, I may observe, of the matter and the form at the same time is certainly more to be regarded in the eucharist, but still to be as carefully attended to as may be, in the performing of baptism. I know not why there should be any interval whatever; when, from some necessity, such does occur, it must be most brief, even at the longest. It is to be remembered that in the sacraments the words or forms have a consecrating power, and are, in truth, effective of that which they signify: hence, to sever the one from the other destroys the validity of the administration.

In another place Lyndwood enters at some length into the same subject. "Si baptizans in baptizando nulla verba profert, non est baptizatio legitima; quia alterum essentialium deficit, sc. verbum: quod si proferat verba, impertinentia tamen ad baptismum, tunc idem est: quia paria reputantur nulla verba proferre, et proferre aliqua sed impertinentia. Aut profert

---

<sup>44</sup> We have a French form, in cases of necessity, by women, about the same period, in some visitation articles proposed in a council at Rhemes, A. D. 1408.

"Enfant, je te baptise au nom du Pere, et du Filz, et du S. Esperit. Amen." Martene. *Vet. Script. tom. vii. p. 418.* It is given also in Peccham's constitution.

verba pertinentia, sed mutando formam: et hæc mutatio fit circa formam intelligibilem, et circa significationem seu modum significationis, ut si diceret, *Ego baptizo te in nomine genitoris, et geniti, et flaminis almi*, non tenebit baptismus:<sup>45</sup> quia genitor et genitus non significant personas modo principali, sed actus notionales potius: dicit etiam *B. Tho. super. 4. sen.* quod si dicatur, *Baptizo te in nomine Trinitatis*, non valet baptismus: et hoc verum intelligo, si solum fiat implicate et non explicite. Baptismus namque fieri debet in nomine Trinitatis, sic ut Personæ explicentur. —Et breviter dico, quod si dimittatur, alias omittatur aliqua dictio de substantia verborum ad baptismum per Christum institutorum, non valet baptismus. Idem intelligo si addatur aliqua dictio quæ non sit de forma baptismi:<sup>46</sup> vel si verba dicantur ordine præpostero. Formæ namque verborum nihil addendum, vel detrahendum est. Ubi tamen verba substantialia formæ mutantur in aliud idioma, ita tamen quod sit idem modus significandi, et eadem significatio: talis mutatio non obest. Nam forma realis potius attendenda est, quam verbalis. Et idem est ubi talis est mutatio ver-

---

<sup>45</sup> “ Quid si quis baptizetur in nomine genitoris, et nati, et sancti flaminis? dic quod tenet: quia nec refert utrum ex æquipollentibus quid dicatur. *ff. de verborum obligation. quæ extrinsecus. et l. si in nomine. infra de verborum significatio. tamen his.* hanc tamen æquipollentiam non nimis

prosequaris, ut patet in his quæ notantur supra eodem versiculo. Et nunquid potest baptizari in nomine paternitatis, filiationis, et spiritualis sanctitatis? non.” *Hostiensis, in Summa. lib. III. rubr. xlij. §. 6.*

<sup>46</sup> Compare his own interpretation of this rule, above.

borum, ex qua non mutatur vera significatio formæ.<sup>47</sup> Quod si in prolatione verborum fiat aliqua discontinuatio, sive interpositio modica; ut puta ratione tussis vel respirationis, aut alterius impedimenti hujusmodi, non nocet. Secus si sit magna, talis sc. quæ actum evidenter discontinuat.”<sup>48</sup>

The Pupilla oculi sums up the way in which the form may be rendered insufficient, under seven heads: giving examples of each. “Septem utique modis forma vitietur; s. additione, subtractione, interpositione, verbi pro verbo positione, mutatione, corruptione, et verborum transpositione facta vel factis scienter et ex deliberatione. Quantum ad additionem nota: quod si alicubi addatur aliquid ad formam quod confundit intellectum verborum, ut si dicatur *ego baptizo te in nomine patris majoris; et filii minoris; vel alio modo consimili; impeditur baptismus. Si autem fiat additio alicujus quæ non vitiat intellectum formæ, non impedit: ut si dicatur in nomine Patris ingeniti, etc. Dum tamen fiat talis additio ex simplicitate et devotione cum debita intentione baptizandi; et non volendo introducere hæresim seu novum ritum, vel mutare formam a Christo institutam, et in ecclesia usitatam. Si autem addatur conditio quæ non existit utpote dicendo,*

<sup>47</sup> This clause seems opposed to his decision above. It is of course to be remembered that these opinions are referrible to other canonists, and the canon-law: but whether so or not, Lyndwood

must be generally understood as adopting them, except where it is otherwise stated.

<sup>48</sup> *Lib. 1. tit. 7.* Quod in constitutione. *verb.* legitime factum.

*si ego sum episcopus baptizo te in nomine Patris*, etc. vel alia conditio similis: sive oratio disjunctiva quæ est contra rationem formæ; quia disjunctiva non potest determinare alteram partem: impeditur baptismus.

“Per subtractionem impeditur baptismus: quando aliquid subtrahitur de verbis mere essentialibus formæ.—

“Interpositio, sive interruptio, si tanta sit quod corrumpat unitatem actus baptizantis,—impedit virtutem baptismi. Ut si baptizans postquam dixerit *ego baptizo in nomine Patris*, interponat unam longam fabulam, vel vadat ad aliud negotium, et postea redeat et dicat, *et Filii*, etc. non est puer baptizatus; nisi reincipiat a principio formæ vocalis, et proferat totam continuatam. Si autem fiat tam modica interruptio, quæ non discontinuet actum secundum communem usum. Ut si forte baptizans volens facere silentium dicat inter verba formæ, taceatis; vel aliud simile; et postea perficiat,—non impeditur baptismus, quia modicum intervallum non impedit.<sup>49</sup>

<sup>49</sup> “Quid si aliquod verbum, quod non est de forma ibi addatur, seu misceatur? dicunt aliqui, quod si præmittatur,—vel si post formam adjiciatur,—efficax est baptismus: quia cum impertinentia extrinsecus adjiciuntur, non vitiant. Si vero interponitur, tunc vitiatur, et non confertur baptismus.—In forma baptismi esse verbum aliud a verbis Domini alienum, et impertinens censi debet. Doc-

tores tamen nostri dicunt, quod sive præmittatur, sive sequatur, sive interponatur, semper vitiatur baptismus; quia formæ nihil detrahendum est, vel addendum.—Quid si dicat, ‘Ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, et omnium sanctorum’ non est baptizatus; et in hoc hodie omnes conveniunt.” Hosti. *ut supra*.



“Verbi pro verbo positione quandoque vitiatur baptismus.—Ut si loco hujus dictionis Patris, diceretur genitoris, seu potentis :—quia non appropriata divinis personis, sed expressa nomina trium personarum proferri debent.

“Item mutatione: ut si baptizans proferret istam formam verborum in baptizando; *nos baptizamus te*; non esset puer baptizatus. Quia hoc pronomen, nos, importat plures baptizantes, cum tantum unus baptizaret. Nec etiam sic dicendo; *ego baptizo vos*; cum tantum unus baptizatur.—Clara requiritur expressio verborum in baptismo. Et consimiliter si diceret baptizans, *nos baptizamus te*, non esset puer baptizatus.<sup>50</sup>—Non vere baptizaret qui diceret, *ego baptizo te in nomine Trinitatis*, quia requiritur, ut dictum est, expressio personarum.

“Corruptio verbi, si tanta sit quod non maneat ejus significatio, nec secundum primariam institutionem, nec secundum usus accommodationem, impedit baptismi virtutem.<sup>51</sup>

<sup>50</sup> The author continues: “Ego tamen pie credo, quod si baptizans esset persona honorabilis, habens in communi usu sic loqui pluraliter, non faciens hoc ex industria, nec volens pervertere morem ecclesiæ consuetum: bene teneret baptismus.”

<sup>51</sup> “Retulerunt nuntii tui quod fuerit in eadem provincia sacerdos, qui Latinam linguam penitus igno-

rabat, et dum baptizaret, nesciens Latini eloqui, infringens linguam diceret, Baptizo te in nomine Patria, et Filia, et Spiritu Sancta. Ac per hoc tua reverenda fraternitas consideravit eos rebaptizare. Sed, sanctissime frater, si ille, qui baptizavit, non errorem introducens, aut hæresim; sed pro sola ignorantia Romanæ locutionis infringendo linguam, ut supra fati-

“Transpositio etiam verborum si talis sit quæ impediatur sensum orationis quem haberet ex vi ordinis verborum, impedit virtutem baptismi; ut si dicatur, *ego Patris et Filii baptizo te in nomine Spiritus Sancti*. Vel sic, *ego baptizo te aliquid nomine*, etc. Quia utrobique alienatur sensus formæ baptismalis.—Et ita de consimilibus est dicendum. Alia vero est transpositio quæ non mutat sensum quem habet forma baptismi ex vi ordinis verborum; non impedit virtutem baptismi, nisi sic transponens intenderet mutare communem formam ecclesiæ. Si autem baptizans diceret verba sacramentalia sub hoc ordine, *ego baptizo te in nomine Filii, et Patris, et Spiritus Sancti*, dicunt canonistæ quod ordo verborum est de substantia baptismi. Et ideo cum tali ordine verborum præposterato, non confertur baptismus.<sup>52</sup> Dicunt tamen Scotus et alii theologi

sumus, baptizans dixisset; non possumus consentire, ut denuo baptizentur.” De consecr. *dist.* iv. *cap.* 86.

This canon is from an epistle of pope Zachary to S. Boniface, archbishop of Mentz; which is given entire in the *Bibl. Patrum*, tom. xiiij. p. 126. The writer concludes by declaring that the opinion of the fathers had always been unanimous, that baptism is valid, as to the form, if conferred “*In nomine Patris, etc.*” This, however, would scarcely prove the correctness of the decree just cited.

The 140th epistle of the same to the same, seems also to suggest some further doubts. *ibid.* p. 132. See Baronius, *ad an.* 744. n. ij.

<sup>52</sup> For example, Manuel Calecas: *lib.* 1. *contra Græcos*. “Si quem sacerdos baptizaret, atque ita baptizans, pronuntiaret, *Baptizo te in nomine Patris, et Spiritus, et Filii*, ecclesia hujusmodi baptizatum, quasi baptismo consecratum, nunquam admitteret: eo quod non juxta Domini traditionem baptizatus esset.” *Bibl. Patrum*, tom. 26. p. 385.

quod tenet baptismus: quia personæ divinæ, quocunque ordine nominatæ, sunt unum efficiens principale in baptismo. Nec videtur omnino necessarium ex parte sacramenti quod servetur ordo prioritatis originis: quamvis minister graviter peccaret rectum ordinem pervertendo.”<sup>53</sup>

These are long extracts: but they cannot need apology. I know it to be most certain that there are many priests in the church of England, whose attention and consideration have been but very scanty directed even to the broad and general inquiry, What is the valid Form in the sacrament of baptism? much less have they entered into its details, or into the many questions, of varying importance, involved in the discussion of it.


It is true that,—unlike some of the doubts, which negligence and want of thought, as regards the Matter, may cast upon the true administration of the sacrament,—it is highly improbable that, in our Church in modern times, there is ever an insufficient or improper pronunciation of the Form. Indeed the unhesitating reception and use of it, in the almost universal ignorance (though it be) of the difficulties which might possibly arise, tend in themselves to so desirable a result. But, however this may be, there is no one who is interested in the subject of this dissertation, but who will be glad to know the rules and principles by which, for many generations, the ministers

---

<sup>53</sup> *Pars 2. cap. iij.*

of the church of England were guided, in their judgment as to a true form, either in the conferring of this sacrament, or in their acknowledgment of a baptism declared to have been already received. The works from which I have quoted, were the great authorities in the age immediately preceding the reformation. Lyndwood and Hostiensis still hold their place ; and, probably, much of the neglect into which the *Pupilla oculi* has fallen, is alone owing to the extreme rarity of the book.

## CHAPTER VI.

 HERE is a question which, possibly, has already occurred to the reader, consequent upon as it is, and mixed up with, much that I have just said. I propose to examine it in the present chapter. It is this; whether baptism “in the Name of Jesus,” or “in the Name of Jesus Christ,” with no mention made of Either of the other Divine Persons, can be regarded as ever having been acknowledged by the Church to be valid? Or, to put it in another shape: if it be of the essence of the Form of a valid baptism, that it should contain a plain and distinct mention or enunciation of the Three Persons of the Undivided Trinity, how is it that, nevertheless, we read more than once in the Acts of the apostles, of baptism “in the Name of Jesus Christ?”

The very learned Bingham has a short section upon this point: beginning with the assertion that “among all the writings of the ancients, he had never yet met with any but two that openly and directly allow or approve of any form of baptism save that which was appointed by Christ at the institution,” he produces those two places; then, making no remark as to the first<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> The place is from Gennadius.      versus eos, qui rebaptizandos hæ-  
 “Ursinus monachus scripsit ad-      reticos decernunt, docens, nec le-



(indeed it is of little importance, being but a second-hand report of the opinion of a certain African monk, whose works are lost) and passing by the other, from S. Ambrose, as being but the singular opinion of a single doctor, he concludes, "that the form of baptizing delivered by Christ was not changed, as some imagine, but precisely observed even by the apostles; and, after them, by the general consent and practice of the Catholick Church."<sup>2</sup>

We must fully agree with the judgment at which Bingham has arrived: although it will not I think be out of place, in the present dissertation, to enter into the difficulty somewhat more particularly than he, perhaps from the nature of his plan, was called upon to do. And I shall myself endeavour to be as brief as may be.

Bingham, omitting the Scripture, alludes only to two passages from the ancients; of which, as I have already said, one only, from S. Ambrose, is of importance. This we shall consider presently. For, first, it is certainly proper that the texts from the Acts, in which baptism "in the name of Jesus" is spoken of should be laid before the reader.

*Ch. ij. v. 38.* "Then Peter said unto them, Repent,

gitimum, nec Deo dignum rebaptizari illos, qui in nomine vel simpliciter Christi, vel in nomine Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, quamvis pravo sensu, baptizentur: iis autem, post sanctæ Trinitatis

et Christi simplicem confessionem, sufficere ad salutem manus impositionem Catholici sacerdotis." *De scriptor. eccles. c. xxvij.*

<sup>2</sup> *Book xi. ch. 3. §. iij.*

and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." *Ch. viij. v. 16.* "The Holy Ghost—as yet was fallen upon none of them: only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus." *Ch. x. v. 48.* "And he commanded them to be baptized in the name of the Lord." Once more; *Ch. xix. v. 5.* "When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus."<sup>3</sup>

Now, it is at once evident that these texts do not go so far as to say, that baptisms were not conferred on the occasions specified, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." They can only be so understood, as to mean that, by inference. And we require, surely, something more than a mere inference, before we can be borne out in concluding, against the plain precept of our Blessed Lord, and against the universal consent and practice of the whole

<sup>3</sup> According to the Latin vulgate, there is another place: "Cum vero credidissent Philippo evangelizanti de regno Dei, in nomine Jesu Christi baptizabantur viri, ac mulieres." *Ch. viij. v. 12.* This is a version, which the received text of the original cannot allow. See, however, the commentaries of Nicolas de Lyra, and Cornelius a Lapide; both of which are upon the vulgate text: although the latter notices the Greek variation. Hugo S. Caro reads "de regno Dei et nomine Jesu Christi." The rendering of the Vulgate is to be

probably traced to, as it is certainly strengthened by, the 16th verse, cited in the text above: the reader will observe, after a consideration of the present chapter, how much the received reading of the Greek favours the interpretation which I believe ought to be put upon all the passages in the Acts, which we are examining. On the other hand, the expression "preaching the things concerning—the name of Jesus Christ," is unusual, and requires explanation. The Syriac, a most important version, reads with the Latin.

Church since their day, that the apostles did not use the appointed form, but baptized, only, "in the name of the Lord Jesus."

It would be a greater difficulty, if either the Church, by her practice, at any time, could be shown to have acknowledged the validity of such a form; or, if the texts which have been cited, would not admit of an interpretation, fully agreeable with her reiterated doctrine.

It has been said indeed by some that these passages are to be strictly interpreted, and that the apostles under a special revelation did so administer the sacrament of baptism. Thus De Lyra, upon the second ch. of the Acts. "*Et bapt. etc. in nomine Jesu. In hac enim forma baptizaverunt apostoli in primitiva ecclesia, consilio Spiritus Sancti, ut nomen Christi, quod erat apud Judæos contemptum et odiosum, amabile redderetur et venerandum. Quo facto rediit ecclesia ad formam à Christo institutam Mat. ultimo.*"<sup>4</sup> Still more expressly by Aquinas; "Ad primum dicendum, quod ex speciali Christi revelatione apostoli in primitiva ecclesia in nomine Christi baptizabant: ut nomen Christi honorabile redderetur per hoc, quod ad ejus invocationem Spiritus Sanctus dabatur in baptismo."<sup>5</sup>

And this is the view which seems to have been taken

<sup>4</sup> Postill. in Gloss. Ordin. tom. vj. See also J. Gerson. *Opera. tom. 2. p. 262.*

<sup>5</sup> Summa. *quæst. lxxvj. art. 6.*

in the church of England, by her canonists, in the middle ages. Thus, Hostiensis: “*Quid si dicat, baptizo te in nomine Christi? videtur baptizatus: quia quod in prædicta forma explicite dicitur, implicite intelligitur hic. Sed credo, quod illud respicit antiquum tempus apostolorum, nam Dominus dixit, in nomine Patris, etc: et ideo hæc forma tenenda est.*”<sup>6</sup>

And Lyndwood: “*Baptismus fieri debet in nomine Trinitatis, sic ut personæ explicentur. Et licet in primitiva ecclesia, inspirante Spiritu Sancto, apostoli baptizabant in nomine Christi ad ampliacionem laudis nominis Christi, hodie tamen talis baptismus non valet.*”<sup>7</sup> Once more, the Pupilla, having declared that such a form is no longer to be permitted, confesses that the apostles baptized “*in nomine Christi, ex familiari consilio Spiritus Sancti.*”<sup>8</sup>

It is scarcely necessary to remark upon this, which appears to have been the usual way of interpretation adopted by the older schoolmen and canonists, that whilst they understand the texts literally, they are yet very careful to add that such baptisms were only valid for a short season;<sup>9</sup> that they were administered “in the name of Christ,” alone, for an especial purpose;

<sup>6</sup> Ut supra, §. 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Lib. 1. tit. 7.* Quod in constitutione. *verb.* legitime factum.

<sup>8</sup> *Pars II. cap. iij.*

<sup>9</sup> Scotus concludes his arguments, doubtfully: “Non audeo dicere, quod baptizatus hodie in nomine Christi, esset baptizatus:

sed nec audeo dicere, quod non esset baptizatus: quia non lego ubi fuerit illa dispensatio revocata. In hoc ergo casu reputo dubium an talis sit baptizatus.” And he recommends the conditional form to be used. *Sentent. lib. IV. dist. 3. quæst. ij.*

and that they rested moreover on an express dispensation, or direction, given by inspiration of the Holy Spirit. So that, even upon such reasoning, no argument can be brought against the universal practice and doctrine of the Church since the apostolic age. One word also, as to the purpose for which, as De Lyra, Aquinas, and others have stated in the extracts above, this form was used by the apostles. It does seem most inadequate. For not only could the invocation of the Three Divine Persons not have thrown any shadow over the glorious Name of the Eternal Son, but rather on the contrary would He be the more highly exalted among men, in the view of both believers and unbelievers, being joined without distinction with the Father and the Holy Ghost.

But, if the apostles did indeed baptize, not in the form of words as it is written, in the gospel of S. Matthew, to have been appointed by our Lord, it is very strange that in the works which have come down to us, of authors who were contemporary and nearly so with the apostles themselves, we find no record whatever of such a practice. Much otherwise; so soon as we can trace at all any form by which the sacrament was conferred, we find it spoken of as “in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” Or, take it in another way. If the apostles baptized “in the name of Jesus,” by virtue of a dispensation, (for any purpose and design however great and excellent) how is it that we have no evidence, not a shadow of proof, that such a dispensation was really



granted? They who insist that these places in the Acts are to be interpreted strictly,—so strictly, as to exclude from the apostolic form the distinct invocation of the Three Divine Persons,—are forced necessarily to the invention of some permission or dispensation for a season. There is not, it is confessed, any other solution of the difficulty which the proof of such a practice by the apostles would involve. As, however, there is no evidence of the fact in the writings of the earliest fathers, so also there is no mention made, either in Scripture or by them, of any permission or dispensation.

Not only, therefore, are we not to interpret these texts to mean, that the apostles did not baptize “in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” but we may very easily explain in more ways than one, how they are to be reconciled with the uniform testimony of all antiquity, and with an undeviating obedience to the command of our Lord.

The following are among the chief interpretations which have been proposed, by which we may understand rightly the above-cited texts. In the first place, the phrase “in the name of Christ,” may signify, (no less when spoken of conferring the sacrament of baptism, than of other facts,) “by the power” or, “by the authority of Christ.” As, where S. Peter, with S. John, said to the lame man at the Beautiful gate of the temple: “In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, rise up and walk.” Or, with reference to the same miracle, where the high-priest and others inquired of

them: "By what power, or by what name, have ye done this?"<sup>10</sup>

Again; that we do not read it plainly asserted that the apostles did use such a form as "I baptize thee in the name of Christ;" but on the contrary, the *phrase* is frequent to be baptized in His name: when used, merely signifying the sure effect of baptism; that by it the apostles made those whom they baptized members of Christ. This is Melancthon's explanation.<sup>11</sup>

Again; bishop Jewell says, "To baptize 'in the Name of Christ,' is to baptize according to the order, institution, and commandment of Christ. Neither do these words, 'in the Name of Christ,' import that baptism was ministered in the Name of Christ only, and in none other name beside, no more than these words—that Paul spake unto the keeper, 'Believe in the Lord Jesus,' do discharge him from believing in the other two Persons of the Holy Trinity."<sup>12</sup>

Again; to be baptized "in the name of Christ," so spoken of as it is in the Acts of the apostles, may simply mean, into the true faith of that Gospel which Jesus preached, and after an open profession of such

<sup>10</sup> Acts. *ch.* iij. *v.* 6. *ch.* iv. *v.* 7.

<sup>11</sup> De usu integri sacr. *Opera.* tom. 2. *p.* 186.

<sup>12</sup> Replie unto M. Harding. *Works.* vol. 1. *p.* 376. "Doubtless he must be very bold with the

Scriptures of God, that will presume hereby to prove, either that the apostles altered the essential form of baptism, or that they proclaimed them heretics, that in baptizing would follow Christ's institution." *Ibid.*

belief.<sup>13</sup> The account of the baptism of the Ethiopian eunuch, by Philip the deacon, confirms this opinion. We there, first, have it recorded that the confession was required and made; "he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." If after this circumstantial account we further found that he was baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus," there would be some grounds for that opinion which, as I have already stated, the earlier schoolmen held. But, on the contrary, (and we must not pass it over as of little importance) the sacred history continues; "they went down both into the water;—and he baptized him." That is, in the accustomed manner, and with the appointed form, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Again; a modification of the purpose supposed to be in view, and already spoken on, has been suggested;

<sup>13</sup> "Ita S. Joannes Damascenus. In Christum baptizatum esse, nihil aliud indicat quam in illum credendo salutifera aqua tingi: *etc.*" *Orthod. fid. lib. 4. cap. 10. cit.* Tournely, *p.* 111. Compare also the account given by S. Paul, of his own baptism: and how Ananias said to him, "why tarriest thou? arise and be baptized, and wash away thy sins, calling on the name of the Lord." So understanding the expression "in the name of Jesus," or "in the name of the Lord," as connected with the administration of

baptism, we must, of course, refer it not to the minister, but to the recipient, by whom the profession of belief in Him, is previously to be made.

Waterland takes this view of the difficulty: declaring it to be the most probable and generally received account of the matter. *Moyer Sermons. viij. Works. vol. 2. p. 173.* So also bishop Bull. *Works. vol. 2. p. 15.* Compare, Facundus, *pro defens. trium Capitul. Bibl. Patrum. tom. x. p. 7. H.*

that the apostles added to the form, the name of Jesus Christ: in order to testify their veneration of Him, Who as man had been despised, and rejected, and crucified by their countrymen. In which case, the words would probably have been, “and of the Son, Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost.”<sup>14</sup> This, as I have before shown, would not affect the validity of the form; but, on the other hand, there is no evidence of such a practice, and against other more reasonable interpretations, it can scarcely be regarded as of much weight. The reader may come to his own opinion.

Lastly; there have been various passages produced from the fathers, having especial respect to these texts, showing that in their judgment, by one Divine Person alone being named, the other two Persons are not therefore excluded. S. Cyprian says, in his epistle to Jubaianus, before cited: “Jesu Christi mentionem facit Petrus, non quasi Pater omitteretur, sed ut Patri quoque Filius adjungeretur.”<sup>15</sup>

<sup>14</sup> “Non defuit qui doceret præposuisse apostolos formulæ baptismi à Christo præscriptæ nomen Jesu Christi: ad hunc scilicet modum. *In nomine Jesu Christi: ego te baptizo in nomine Patris, etc.*: exemplo suo id approbantes, commendantesque, quod expressissime præcepit Paulus Colossensibus scribens, iij. 17. Vel si mavis (inquit Calmet allegans Harduinum) initiari jubentur baptis-  
mate fideles post invocatum nomen

Jesu Christi, id est, post confessionem ejusdem nominis, quod perinde est, ac si confiteri juberentur, Jesum Christum Deum esse, prævia confessione, deinde baptis-  
mate, in quo tres personæ expresse nominarentur.” Trombelli, tom. iv. p. 406.

<sup>15</sup> Opera, p. 134.

I know that S. Cyprian, immediately before this place, observes: “Alia fuit Judæorum sub apostolis ratio, alia est gentilium con-

S. Augustin, in his second book against Maximin the Arian, is arguing against the objection, that the Holy Spirit is not God, because the Scripture does not plainly declare that He created the world. His reply is based upon the fact, that it may, in like manner, be falsely asserted that persons were not baptized in the name of the Three Divine Persons, because we find it stated that they were baptized "in the name of the Lord Jesus." "Si autem quia non est nominatus [Spiritus Sanctus] quod etiam per illum facta sit creatura, quando de Filio dictum est, *Omnia per ipsum facta sunt*; ideo putas Dei Spiritum non esse

---

ditio. Illi, quia jam legis et Moysi antiquissimum baptismum fuerant adepti, in nomine quoque Jesu Christi erant baptizandi; secundum quod in actis apostolorum Petrus ad eos loquitur et dicit; 'Pœnitementi, etc.' And it is true that, resting upon this, S. Cyprian has been appealed to, as an authority in favour of the validity of baptism, in certain cases, "in the name of Jesus" only. But, even if the clause, which I have cited in the text, did not immediately follow, and explain the meaning of the holy father, it is evident that his argument is, that the baptism which the Jews had received, and of which S. Paul speaks, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, *ch. x. v. 2.* as being "in the cloud and in the sea,"

was not sufficient: but that more was required: not only the acknowledgment and confession of God the Father, as of old, but of God the Son also: and not of Either, alone, but of the Three Divine Persons together.

If we are to understand S. Cyprian as affirming that one form had once been used in baptizing the Gentiles, another, "in the name of Jesus" only, in baptizing the Jews, we should find it difficult to explain how it was that S. Peter is expressly recorded to have desired that the Gentiles also should be baptized "in the name of the Lord." In other words: whatever sense we put upon it, it was not appropriated, as a form, to the Jews.



creatorem : procul dubio, nec in ejus nomine poteris baptizatos dicere, quibus ait Petrus, Agite pœnitentiam, *etc.*—Si autem etiam non nominatis Patre et Spiritu Sancto, in nomine Jesu Christi jussi sunt baptizari ; et tamen intelliguntur non baptizati nisi in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti ; cur non sic audis de Filio Dei, *Omnia per ipsum facta sunt* ; ut et non nominatum intelligas ibi etiam Spiritum Sanctum ? ”<sup>16</sup>

Tournely has brought forward a decision of the venerable Bede, which, contrary as it is to his commentary on the Acts and possibly in correction of it, is deserving of our attention. “ Si quis baptizans dicat, baptizo te in Christo Jesu ; et non dicat, in nomine Patris, *etc.* sicut Dominus instituit, non est verus baptismus.”<sup>17</sup>

I shall now lay before the reader the famous passage in S. Ambrose’s treatise of the Holy Spirit, which Bingham has quoted, and indeed upon which the whole array of opinions in favour of the validity of baptisms conferred “ in the name of Jesus ” may truly be said to depend : so that, as Bellarmin has observed,<sup>18</sup> if S.

<sup>16</sup> Opera, tom. viij. p. 715.

<sup>17</sup> Var. quæst. q. 14.

The place in the commentary by Bede, is upon the 48th verse of the 10th ch. of Acts. “ *Et jussit eos, etc.* Cum ecclesiæ regula sit, fideles in nomine sanctæ Trinitatis baptizari, quæritur quomodo Lucas per totum libelli hujus

textum, non aliter quam in nomine Jesu Christi baptismum dari testetur ? Quod ita beatus Ambrosius solvit, quod per unitatem nominis impletum mysterium sit.”

<sup>18</sup> Opera. tom. 2. p. 114. And his commentator excuses the doubt expressed by Scotus, (see above, note 9.) on this very ground :

Ambrose did not really intend to affirm that which, at first sight, his language appears to convey, the chief foundation of those opinions must be destroyed. The words of S. Ambrose are ;

“ Qui benedicitur in Christo, benedicitur in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti ; quia unum nomen, potestas una : ita etiam ubi operatio aliqua divina, aut Patris, aut Filii, aut Spiritus designatur, non solum ad Sanctum Spiritum, sed etiam ad Patrem refertur et Filium : nec solum ad Patrem, sed etiam ad Filium refertur et Spiritum. Denique Æthiops eunuchus Candacis reginæ baptizatus in Christo, plenum mysterium consequutus est.—Baptizati sunt itaque in nomine Jesu Christi : nec iteratum est in his baptisma, sed novatum ; unum enim baptisma. Ubi autem non est plenum baptismatis sacramentum, nec principium, vel species aliqua baptismatis æstimatur. Plenum autem est, si Patrem et Filium Spiritumque Sanctum fatearis. Si unum neges, totum subrues. Et quemadmodum si unum in sermone comprehendas, aut Patrem, aut Filium, aut Spiritum Sanctum, fide autem nec Patrem, nec Filium, nec Spiritum Sanctum abneges, plenum est fidei sacramentum : ita etiam quamvis et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum dicas, et aut Patris, aut Filii, aut Spiritus Sancti minuas potestatem, vacuum est omne mysterium.—Nunc consideremus, utrum quemadmodum in Christi nomine plenum esse

---

“ propter auctoritatem Magistri, præjudicare Doctor.” *tom. 8. p.*  
et Ambrosii,—quibus non vult 179.

legimus baptismatis sacramentum; ita etiam Sancto tantum Spiritu nuncupato, nihil desit ad mysterii plenitudinem. Rationem sequamur; quia qui unum dixerit, Trinitatem signavit. Si Christum dicas, et Deum Patrem à quo unctus est Filius, et ipsum qui unctus est, Filium, et Spiritum Sanctum quo unctus est, designasti. Scriptum est enim, *Hunc Jesum à Nazareth, quem unxit Deus Spiritu Sancto.* [Act. x. 38.] Et si Patrem dicas, et Filium ejus et Spiritum oris ejus pariter indicasti; si tamen id etiam corde comprehendas. Et si Spiritum dicas, et Deum Patrem, à quo procedit Spiritus: et Filium, quia Filii quoque est Spiritus, nuncupasti.”<sup>19</sup>

Bingham accepts this passage, as if S. Ambrose did indeed intend to insist upon the validity of baptism administered in one Name only: but, even then, he passes it by as of little weight, “being a singular opinion, contrary to the general stream and current of the ancient writers.” Perhaps this is not an unreasonable conclusion, in such cases, when no other mode of meeting the difficulty can be found; but it is always the last which we should adopt; and, when we attempt to judge so great a father as S. Ambrose, much more careful ought we to be, before we venture to put any interpretation upon his words, which will make him opposed to the uniform and constant teaching of the church down to his own time. This also should

---

<sup>19</sup> Opera. tom. 2. p. 607.

be, when even questions of less importance, than is the sacrament of baptism, are concerned.

But the present case is more than merely doubtful; it is almost certain, that S. Ambrose in this place is not alluding to the form in baptism: and if he is not, then the whole difficulty is at an end. They, who so understand him, must allow, that he also teaches that baptism, administered in the name of the Holy Ghost alone, is equally valid: an opinion, for which, unlike that which insists upon baptism "in the name of Jesus," there is not an appearance of support in the sacred scripture: and one, which, with the single exception of Peter Lombard,<sup>20</sup> is unanimously rejected. It is strange that the schoolmen, and others, who, relying on this passage of S. Ambrose, have cited that father in favour of their doctrine, should not have perceived this consequence.

Again, if S. Ambrose is speaking of the form in baptism, his argument must be referred to the minister of the sacrament: and then, we shall find it very hard

---

<sup>20</sup> "Ex his aperte intellexisti, in nomine Christi verum baptisma tradi: unde nihilominus insinuari videtur, verum baptisma dari posse in nomine Patris tantum, vel Spiritus Sancti tantum, si tamen ille qui baptizat, fidem Trinitatis teneat, quæ Trinitas in quolibet horum nominum intelligitur.— Qui ergo baptizat in nomine Christi, baptizat in nomine Trinitatis, quæ ibi intelligitur. Tutius

est tamen tres personas ibi nominare, ut dicatur: *in nomine Patris*, etc: non in nominibus, sed in nomine: i. e. in invocatione, vel, confessione Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti: invocatur enim ibi tota Trinitas, ut invisibiliter ibi operetur per se; sicut extra visibiliter per ministerium. Si autem dicatur *in nominibus*, non est sacramentum, quia non servatur forma baptismi." IV. *dis.* iij.

to evade another consequence, no less unsound and dangerous: namely, that the validity of the sacrament depends upon the faith, or upon the worthiness, of the minister. What else possibly can that sentence mean, “*Quamvis et Patrem et Filium et Spiritum dicas, et aut Patris, aut Filii, aut Spiritus Sancti minuas potestatem, vacuum est omne mysterium?*”

Some suppose that S. Ambrose, like many fathers who were before him, is in this place explaining the apparent difficulty which arises from the texts in the Acts of the apostles, where baptism “in the name of Christ” is mentioned. And, if this be so, he agrees with them in the true interpretation which is to be put on the texts, and of which enough has been already said.

But I would far rather consent to the judgment of those, who contend that S. Ambrose is not here speaking at all of the form in baptism, nor of the minister: but, of the recipient, and of the confession of faith previously required of him. And it is of him, therefore, that he argues, that it is not essential that there should be an explicit pronunciation of belief in each of the Three Divine Persons, separately, by name: for, that it is impossible that any one can rightly acknowledge God the Son, without an equal acknowledgment, by implication, of the Father, and of the Holy Spirit.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>21</sup> I say “rightly acknowledge,” the Son, nay, God the Son, and because it is easy to acknowledge yet not hold rightly the Christian



So understood, also, S. Ambrose does not contradict himself, in numberless other parts of his works : and, certainly, this is an end no less to be desired, than that he should not be opposed, singly, to the otherwise common consent and testimony of all antiquity. “Nisi baptizatus fuerit,” is his sentence in another book, “in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus Sancti, remissionem non potest accipere peccatorum, nec spiritualis gratiæ munus haurire.”<sup>22</sup>

I do not delay to examine further extracts which have been produced from other fathers, by writers

belief in the true doctrine of the Blessed Trinity. Hence, there arises an insurmountable objection against interpreting S. Ambrose, as speaking of the minister of the sacrament, not of the recipient. Because, as regards the last, if he “rightly” confesses his belief in the Son, by implication he believes also rightly in the Father and in the Holy Spirit : but this confession must precede, it may be, at some little distance of time, the actual administration of the Sacrament. Then, there must be no merely implicit mention and declaration of the Three Divine Persons : both, because the appointment of the form by our Lord includes a distinct naming of each Person : (and so all the fathers understood it;) and, because the sacrament is an external and visible sign, requiring an audi-

ble invocation of the Three Persons, separately and explicitly.

<sup>22</sup> *Opera. tom. 2. p. 330.* Having entered, and necessarily, at so great a length into the true meaning of this passage in S. Ambrose, I cannot conclude without adding also the note of his Benedictine editors : who, of all men, would be qualified to form a just judgment, as to the real sense in which we are to interpret it.

“Vix alius Ambrosianus locus tantam dissidii segetem, quantam hic præbuit theologis.—Itaque ut rimando sensui Ambrosiano lucem afferat cardinalis [Bellarminus] præmonet Ambrosium ex Basilio quem secutus est, intelligendum; seque addit iis accedere, qui Ambrosium et ex eo Bedam non de forma baptismi accipiendos credunt, sed tantum de verbis Actuum, quæ proferuntur : nec aliud

who insist on the validity of the form "in the name of the Lord Jesus." Bingham might have noticed S. Augustine, Fulgentius, Ferrandus diaconus, Vigilius Tapsensis, and others; except that he probably and rightly decided that they did, in fact, not teach the doctrine which has been imputed to them.<sup>23</sup>

---

velle sanctum doctorem, quam eo loco et similibus, in quibus una quælibet divinarum personarum, alias duas tacite inclusas contineri. Eamdem proponunt solutionem Estius in 4. *Sent. dist.* 3. §. 5. Nicolai *observat. ad D. Tho.* locum cit. Alexander sæc. 3. *dissert.* 13. et Hardouinus *de bapt. in nomine Christi*. Sed tres ultimi priori responsioni secundam adjiciunt. Dicunt enim Ambrosium hoc loco de illa tantum fidei professione explicandum, quam qui baptizabantur adulti, edere solebant. Namque interrogati, ut alibi vidimus, *credis in Patrem*, respondebant, *credo*. Et sic de duabus aliis personis. Hoc igitur intendit sanctus præsul baptizandos etsi de una sola Trinitatis persona rogati essent, respondissentque, baptismum tamen legitimum accepturos fuisse, dummodo rectam de tota Trinitate fidem animo retinerent. Quæ duæ expositiones quin sint per se veritati consentaneæ, dubium nemini videatur: sed posterior magis quam prior congruit cum verbis Ambrosii.

—Sed quod argumentum multo validius existimandum est, Ambrosius ipse sexcentis locis trium personarum prolationem ad verum baptismum necessario requiri adseverat."

<sup>23</sup> The most earnest supporter of the validity of the form "In the Name of Jesus Christ," and that such was the practice of the apostles, was cardinal Orsi, who wrote a treatise on the question. 4to. *Milan*. 1733. He was answered by Drouven, a doctor of the Sorbonne, in a tract included in his work "de re sacramentaria," fol. *Venet.* 1756. Hardouin also wrote a short dissertation, "de baptismo in nomine Christi," against the use at any time of such a form; which is printed by Zaccaria in his *Thesaurus theologicus*, tom. x. *pars.* 1.

I would quote the decision of the Magdeburgh centuriators, which, at least, does not fail for want of positiveness. "Phrasis illa, qua Lucas utitur, *baptizati sunt in nomine Domini*, significat eos baptizatos esse eo modo, ut

There is, however, an epistle of S. Bernard, upon which much reliance has been placed; and, allowing it to be genuine (of which there seems to be no reasonable doubt<sup>24</sup>), we cannot be surprised that it should have been so. Henry, archdeacon of Orleans, had inquired of him, whether the baptism of an infant, whom a certain laic had baptized, with these words, "I baptize thee in the name of God, and of the holy and true cross," was to be considered valid. S. Bernard decides in the affirmative; inasmuch as by the name of God, the one substance of the Trinity is expressed: and he continues; "*in eo ipso quod addidit, sanctæ et veræ crucis, manifeste commendavit Domini- cam passionem.*" Upon this last sentence, no remark seems necessary: it can but be regarded as an addition, not affecting the question of the validity or invalidity of the preceding form. As to that, S. Bernard supports his judgment with the single proof of the often-mentioned texts in the Acts: and, as he very probably mistook the true meaning of the place in the treatise

---

Christus instituit, nempe *In nomine Patris, etc.* Nam formam baptismi à Christo traditam apostolos mutasse, impium est cogitare aut asserere." *Lib. 2. cap. 1v. p. 354.*

<sup>24</sup> Estius denies it: but without reason. *In 4. dist. 3. pars. 5.*

Both Mabillon and Horstius acknowledge the epistle: as being in former editions and in the Sorbonne MS. The latter, in his note, *p. xcij.* supposes that S. Bernard decided, not without some authority in his own day: but incorrectly; and against the unanimous opinion of the earlier fathers.

by S. Ambrose,<sup>25</sup> which we have just examined, he was doing no more than legitimately carrying out that father's reasoning. His error is to be traced to the misunderstanding of it.

---

<sup>25</sup> As it certainly was mistaken by the contemporaries of S. Bernard ; for example, by Algerus, in

his treatise on the eucharist, against Berengarius. *lib. III. cap. XIV. Bibl. Patrum. tom. 21. p. 292.*

## CHAPTER VII.



BEFORE we finally conclude our consideration of this important question, the Form in baptism, I would remind the reader of some canons, by councils of the highest authority, which support the judgment at which we ought to arrive and the opinions already expressed. And, although we do not know the exact date when they were first collected, or promulgated, the first place<sup>1</sup> is due to those which are commonly called the apostolical canons.

<sup>1</sup> “§. x. Nostram de canonum horum antiquitate ac origine sententiam paucis aperiamus. Quamquam enim eos vel ab ipsis apostolis conscriptos esse, vel Clementi tanquam amanuensi dictatos affirmare non ausim, ne cum Damasceno eos inter canonicos sacrarum scripturarum libros recensendos judicarem, nullus tamen dubito quin à viris apostolicis, hoc est, secundo labente et ineunte tertio à Christi nativitate seculo constituti passim deinceps innotuerint. — §. xi. Et quidem nonnullos ex hisce canonibus à conciliis tunc dierum celebratis editos fuisse, nemo inficias eat. — Priusquam concilia libere celebrata sunt, hi canones et editi fuerunt, et col-

lecti. Quemadmodum autem nihil certi de primis canonum Ecclesiæ universæ collectoribus, nec de priscæ istius latinæ editionis à Justello editæ auctore constat; sic etiam nec certi aliquid vel de tempore vel loco quo collecti sunt hi canones apostolici, determinare possumus. — §. xiv. Ut ut est, ex prædictis facile adducor ut credam universam propemodum ecclesiæ primitivæ disciplinam per hosce canones administratam fuisse. Quapropter quemadmodum canones Nicæni, Ancyрани, Neocæcarienses, etc. *codex canonum ecclesiæ universæ*, et canones Carthaginenses, *codex canonum ecclesiæ Africanæ* vocitantur; sic et hi, qui apostolorum dicuntur



Of these, the 49th enjoins "If any bishop or presbyter, contrary to the ordinance of the Lord, does not baptize into the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but into three unoriginated beings, or three sons, or three comforters, let him be deposed." And the 50th, "— the Lord said not, 'Baptize into my death,' but, 'Go, teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'" The ancient glosses upon these canons do little more than repeat them in other words:<sup>2</sup> Zonaras adds; "Dominus ait, Euntes, *etc.* Necesse est igitur orthodoxum quemque baptizare secundum tale præceptum; et non in tres, qui principio careant, vel tres filios, vel tres paracletos. Id enim est contra ecclesiasticam traditionem et consuetudinem. Unum enim principii expertem ecclesia sumpsit adorandum, Patrem, quia sine causa est, et unum Filium, propter ineffabilem generationem, et unum Paracletum, Spiritum Sanctum, propter processionem."<sup>3</sup>

The 19th canon of the council of Nice has been cited above; in which the baptisms, under an imperfect form, administered by the Paulianist heretics, were ordered to be repeated.<sup>4</sup>

---

canones, ut ab ecclesia primitiva constituti et collecti, *codex canonum ecclesiæ primitivæ* merittissimo jure nuncupantur." Bevereg. *annott. in can. apost. p. 4.* I would earnestly refer the student to the whole preliminary essay, by this most learned author.

See also, Albaspinæus, *observ. l. 1. c. 13.*

<sup>2</sup> Compare Beverege. *ibid. p. 29.*

<sup>3</sup> Bevereg. *pandect. canon. tom. 1. p. 33.*

<sup>4</sup> Above, *p. 110.*

"Istos sane Paulianos bapti-

In the year 314 was celebrated the council of Arles; at which, as it is well known, three British bishops were present. The 8th canon is; “De Afris, quod propria lege sua utuntur ut rebaptizent, placuit ut si ad ecclesiam aliquis de hæresi venerit, interrogent eum symbolum; et si perviderint eum in Patre, et Filio, et Spiritu Sancto esse baptizatum, manus ei tantum imponatur, ut accipiat Spiritum Sanctum. Quod si interrogatus non responderit hanc Trinitatem, baptizetur.”<sup>5</sup> One interpretation has always been given to this canon, nor indeed can it be otherwise understood, without a most forced perversion of it; that it refers solely to the form which may have been used in the baptizing of heretics, desirous of admission into the Church. If they had been baptized “in the name of the Father, *etc.*” i. e. in the due and appointed form, they were to be received with imposition of hands only, or, confirmation.<sup>6</sup> But, if any other form, not making express mention of the

---

zandos esse in ecclesia catholica Nicæno concilio constitutum est. Unde credendum est eos regulam baptismatis non tenere, quam secum multi hæretici, quum de catholica discederent abstulerunt, eamque custodiunt.” S. Augustin. *de hæres. c. xlv. Opera. tom. viij. p. 14.*

And Innocent II. explaining how it was that the synod did not reject the baptism of the Novatians: “idcirco distinctum esse ipsis duabus hæresibus, ratio ma-

nifeste declarat, quia Paulianistæ in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti minime baptizabant: et Novatiani iisdem tremendis venerandisque nominibus baptizant.” *Epist. xxij. ad episc. Macedon. c. v.*

<sup>5</sup> Concil. Mansi. *tom. 2. col. 472.*

<sup>6</sup> S. Leo says; “Hi, qui baptismum ab hæreticis acceperunt, sola invocatione Spiritus Sancti per impositionem manuum confirmandi sunt, quia formam tantum

Three Divine Persons, had been used, then such a baptism was to be accounted invalid. Hence, no argument could be deduced in favour of the rebaptization, generally, of heretics. It is in this sense, therefore, that S. Augustine has appealed to the council of Arles, against the Donatists.<sup>7</sup>

Perhaps about the same time,<sup>8</sup> but, according to Beverege, some forty years later, the council of Laodicea was assembled: which, by its 8th canon, thus decreed. “Quod qui ab eorum hæresi, qui Phryges dicuntur, conversi sunt,—cum omni studio catechizandi sunt, et ab ecclesiæ episcopis et presbyteris baptizandi.”<sup>9</sup> Upon this order Binius remarks, and we may fully agree with him; “Cataphrygarum baptismus iterari jubetur, quia non ea forma, qua ecclesia utitur, collatus fuerit; reliquorum hæreticorum vero, qui hanc baptizandi formam rite observabant, baptismata raturum ac validum esse, ideoque nequaquam iterandum, ecclesia recte dijudicavit.”<sup>10</sup>

baptismi sine sanctificationis virtute sumpserunt. Et hanc regulam, ut scitis, servandam in omnibus ecclesiis prædicamus, ut lavacrum semel initum, nulla iteratione violetur, dicente Apostolo: *unus Dominus, una fides, unum baptismata*. Cujus ablutio nulla iteratione temeranda est, sed, ut diximus, sola sanctificatio Spiritus Sancti invocanda est: ut quod ab hæreticis nemo accipit, a catholicis sacerdotibus consequatur.” *Ibid.*

*tom. 6. col. 334. Epist. ad Nicetam. cap. vij.*

<sup>7</sup> *Lib. ij. cap. 9. Opera. tom. 9. p. 103.*

<sup>8</sup> Baronius. *Annal. tom. 6. p. 191.*—(Appendix ad an. 395.) Mansi places the council under the year 320.

<sup>9</sup> Pandect. canon. *tom. 1. p. 456.*

<sup>10</sup> Notæ: *in concil. collect. Mansi. tom. 2. col. 596.*

I do not think it requisite to heap up further testimonies from succeeding councils: in all, where any notice is taken of the question of the baptism of heretics, the constant rule and practice seems to have depended, whether as to receiving or rejecting it, upon the fact, on the one hand, of the true form, or on the other, of any substitute, having been used in the administration of the sacrament. I should have added to the above canons, the seventh of the œcumenical council of Constantinople, if it had been certainly genuine. But, although both Balsamon and Zonaras accept it without hesitation, yet Beverege in his notes specifies various objections against it,<sup>11</sup> neither does it occur in any of the Latin versions of the decrees of that council. It will be, therefore, quite enough to state, that it coincides in its resolution with the foregoing canons: only, entering into more particulars; and of great value (whether genuine or not as by the synod of Constantinople) in determining the correct interpretation which we are to give to similar canons of other councils. For it enumerates some bodies of heretics, Arians, Novatians, &c. who after confirmation were to be received: and again, others, as the Eunomians, Phrygians, and Sabellians “teaching the identity of the Father and the Son,” whose baptism could not be accounted valid.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Pandect. canon. tom. 1. p. 97. *Annott.* tom. 2. p. 100.

<sup>12</sup> The Eunomians were but a

branch of the Arians: and there could be no reason why the baptism of the one should be rejected,

And now, being about to close my remarks, however imperfectly, upon this part of my dissertation,—the Form in Baptism,—I must warn the reader against the hasty supposition that it has been entered into at too great a length. It is true, indeed, that our usual books and treatises upon this sacrament pass it over altogether with scarcely a remark: this, perhaps, in some instances, from the nature of the argument or discussion more immediately before the writers: and, in others, where we might reasonably have expected some account of the difficulties involved in it, or the resolution of those difficulties, it is not for me to suggest excuses why so important a subject has been thus contemptuously disregarded.

For, it is important. So many councils, in all parts of the world, from the earliest ages to within almost modern times, had it been otherwise, would not have deliberated on the particulars which, constituting its essentials, render a form valid or invalid: nor, would so many of the greatest fathers of the Church have exercised themselves in defending the true form, and in opposing varieties or corruptions which were con-

---

and not of the other, except that the one had introduced some new form. The canon itself remarks of Eunomius, that he had made alterations; baptizing with one immersion; but Socrates adds a very important particular, namely, that he taught his followers to baptize, not into the Trinity, but

into the death of Christ. *Lib. 5. cap. xxiv.* See above, the apostolical canon against this innovation. Cf. Arcudius, *de concordia. p. 18.* Catalani, *comment. in Rit. Rom. tom. 1. p. 35.* Waterland, *Works. vol. 2. p. 187.* The same argument applies to the Sabellians.



tinually proposed: nor, lastly, would our own Church so pointedly enjoin her parish-priests to enquire, in order that they might decide upon the reality or the nullity of any baptism which they may be required to recognize and allow, "With what words was this child baptized?"

Our Blessed Lord, it is universally acknowledged, gave to His disciples a plain injunction, in what Name all nations should be baptized: "in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Whatsoever dispensations from the necessity of using this form may be pleaded, it is beyond measure requisite that they should not be pleaded merely, or conjectured, but should be both proved and grounded on an authority no less than that which issued the original command. Whatsoever changes, whether by addition or alteration of terms, may be introduced, even though it be upon the judgment of whole branches of the Catholic Church, it is equally requisite that they should be clearly shown to convey fully the entire meaning of the appointed and simple words, not explaining it away, or, far less, openly militating against it.

It may perhaps be said, that, in our day and in the church of England, such doubts and difficulties, as would alone justify so long an investigation as we have entered into, are not likely to arise. It is undeniable, at least, that at any time any one of them might occur. And may it not be owing, in some measure, to the want of exact enquiry, according to the strict orders of the rubric, that our parish-priests are so

seldom, as it must be acknowledged that they are so seldom, troubled with any difficulties great or small; or, rather, are themselves so free from all anxiety and hesitation as to the validity of baptisms privately administered, and afterwards brought before them to be admitted and allowed?

For, what questions are they generally accustomed to put to those, who bring to them children which have been “privately” baptized? I scarcely hesitate to assert, that the practice of the vast majority of our clergy is, to sum up, as it were, the four questions of the ritual into one, and ask, Has this child been baptized? Thus, delivering over to the judgment, if we may so call it, of others, the decision which, as the ministers of parishes, they are themselves bound to deliberate upon and determine; or, carelessly accepting the assertions of a fact, upon the evidence of persons who are neither qualified, nor permitted to pronounce upon it.

I say, that they are not *permitted*; nay, they are forbidden to pronounce upon it, because their witness is desired to certain circumstances; first, as to the person by whom the child was baptized; and, as to the persons present on the occasion; these are preliminary points of enquiry. Next, as to two “things essential to the Sacrament, which through fear or haste in such times of extremity, may happen to have been omitted;” namely, as to the matter and the form. Then, these facts being before the proper judge, “the minister of the parish,” he is to “find” from them, whether in-

deed, and truly, "all things were done as they ought to be." And, if he can so determine, he is to say, "*I* certify you, that in this case all is well done, and according unto due order, concerning the baptizing of this child."

Or, let me allow that frequently the first question of the four is put by the minister: "By whom was this child baptized?" And I again assert, that it is very seldom that the examination does not also end with that question, as with it it began. From which we can only come to one of these two reasonable conclusions; either, that a minister is the single essential particular of a valid administration of the sacrament; or, that, as before, the persons who bring the child are the proper judges of the sufficiency of the matter and the form.

So much then, (for I am desirous not to dwell upon it) as regards the common practice of too many of our clergy. I repeat that I shall not be surprised if it shall seem to some of them unnecessary to have argued at so great a length, the subject of the form in baptism; but objections from such quarters are beneath consideration. If, on the one hand, their disobedience to the careful orders of the rubric arises from contempt of that very care and caution, (which I cannot suppose to be except in most rare instances,) they should be advised, rebuked, corrected: if, on the other, from ignorance, they should be taught.

And a few words, further, to those who are accustomed, with all diligence, to put the several questions

appointed in the ritual, upon every occasion of bringing to the church children who have been privately baptized.<sup>13</sup> Not one or two of the questions, but all, and in their due order.

<sup>13</sup> I do not wish to pass over altogether without notice the fact, (and I may remark upon it here) that private administration of baptism being allowed in cases of necessity, the Church has always strongly prohibited it at all other times. The only exception which she has been accustomed to recognise, is that of princes and other rulers. Thus it was ordered by the rubric of the old manuals; "Non licet aliquem baptizare in aula, camera, vel aliquo loco privato, sed duntaxat in ecclesiis in quibus sunt fontes ad hoc specialiter ordinati, nisi fuerit filius regis vel principis, aut talis necessitas emergerit propter quam ad ecclesiam accessus absque periculo haberi non potest." *Monum. Ritualia*, vol. 1. p. 29. This kind of baptism, so allowed, was not strictly "private:" inasmuch as it was conferred with all the usual rites and ceremonies of solemn and public administration.

Lyndwood observes upon and allows the exception, specified in the rubric, in his gloss on the constitution of archbishop Edmund. *Lib. III. tit. 24. Baptisterium. verb. domi.*

Quite agreeable to the rule of the English church, were the prohibitions of foreign councils; thus, in the 14th century, a synodal statute of the diocese of Orleans: "Injungimus vobis presbyteris sub pœna canonica, ne aliquem audeatis baptizare in aulis vel domibus privatorum, sed solum in ecclesiis vestris, nisi in necessitate, et nisi baptizandi sint filii regum et principum." *Veterum script. tom. VII. p. 1290.* To the same purpose a contemporary synodal of the church of Cambrai, *ibid. p. 1346*: compare Martene, *Thes. anecdot. tom. IV. p. 684. 974.* Indeed, at that period there seems to have been a great abuse in this respect: and a decree was introduced into the general body of the canon-law. *Clementin. lib. iij. tit. 15.*

The idle desire of people to have their children baptized at home, is seldom listened to in modern days: and there are, happily, now in our Church few parish-priests who would consent to such a violation of the rules and spirit of their ritual. In the seventeenth century, a great laxity of practice prevailed: and

Now, it is not, by any means, an unlikely event, that the parties who bring the infant may not be able to state "with what words" the baptism had been conferred. This might be from many causes: from want of memory, for example; or, again, "the same fear and haste in times of extremity," which demanded an immediate baptism,—a dying child, and anxiety, and sorrow,—may easily be supposed to have prevented an accurate observation of the exact words which the minister pronounced.

It is a ready answer, "then let the priest baptize it hypothetically, as the rubric enjoins at the end of this same office;" but I do not think it is a safe or a becoming answer. I shall speak presently on this hypothetical form, and shall here merely observe, that it cannot be so understood as to relieve the minister of the parish from all responsibility, and from the exercise of his own judgment in the immediate case before him. It can be indeed rightly resorted to,

the excellent bishop Bull exerted himself earnestly to suppress it. See his life, *p.* 366. He says, himself in one of his charges, (1708): "If private baptism [cases of necessity excepted] may be allowed, away with the fonts in your churches; what do they signify? to what purpose are they there? If all the authority I am invested with can do it, I will see this lamentable abuse of the sa-

crament of baptism reformed." *Works. vol. 2. p. 22.*

Upon another detail, quite worthy the consideration of the clergy, namely, the giving improper names to children at baptism, and the power of the bishop to change them at confirmation, I must refer the reader to my observations in the *Monumenta Ritualia*, vol. 1. *p.* ccx. ccxvj.



when no information whatever can be obtained, as to the words which had been used.

But, supposing that they who bring the child remember, and directly testify that the minister, whoever he was, and for whatever reason, omitted to say, "I baptize thee;" doing no more than pour water on the child, and saying "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," what then? or, if he said "I baptize thee, in the name of Jesus Christ, and of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost?" or, "in the Name of Jesus," only? or, once more, if he said "and of the Holy Spirit?" I would further insist that, in case of such unusual alterations or omissions in the form, it is highly probable that the attention of those who were present would have been excited; they would remember it; and be ready to bear witness to the fact.

Surely, therefore, I would hope that the attempt which I have made to direct the reader to the consideration of the principles by which, in such difficulties, the Church has been guided, and of the rules which she has laid down, with regard to known deviations from the appointed form, may not be without some useful result; either, in determining doubts, if there be any on occasions which none can foresee: or, in enabling the minister of a parish to apply to the particular case which may fall under his judgment, the general principles on which, as I have just said, the Church has acted.

## CHAPTER VIII.



SHALL proceed now to the consideration of this question, “Who is the proper minister of the sacrament of baptism?” An enquiry which will be found to lead us into some examination of another question,—not a little important at this time to be answered by the clergy of the church of England, according to their best belief, either in the negative or the affirmative,—namely, the validity of lay-baptism; or, in other words, the validity of a baptism conferred by an improper, or unauthorized minister.

It is clear that the commission to baptize, as recorded by S. Matthew, was given by our Blessed Lord, not to his followers generally, but to the eleven apostles. It was to them, and to them only, that He said; “Go ye, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, *etc.*” By these words the apostles were invested with authority to deliver this commission to others: “Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.” The power then bestowed was not to die with them, but to continue, equally in their successors as in themselves, even unto the end. Indeed, it was a necessary consequence of the prophecy, that the Church on earth was to remain until the last great Day, that also there should never be wanting the due means of admitting “all nations” within her fold.

To whom, therefore, during their own lives, did the apostles deliver this commission? The sacred writings tell us, not only to bishops and presbyters but to deacons. For Philip, the deacon, in Samaria, baptized “both men and women;” and it was at his hands also that the Ethiopian eunuch received the sacrament of baptism.<sup>1</sup> So that we have the inspired example of the apostles themselves, that ministers in the inferior rank of deacons were qualified to baptize.

I am not able to perceive any reason why this power or qualification was not an essential part of their commission as deacons, in the same way as it was, undeniably, an essential part of the commission given to priests. The sacred history relates the acts of Philip the deacon, in such a manner, I feel confident, as would have convinced every one that, in baptizing, he was but exercising an usual and lawful office of his ministry, if there never had arisen any controversy on the matter. We are told, as it were, as a matter of course, that “he baptized.”

It is true, that so early in the annals of the Church, as in the apostolical canons, (concerning the antiquity of which I have already declared my opinion,) we find bishops and priests not only spoken of as the ministers of baptism, but also, in such a way, as evidently to shew that already deacons were not commonly permitted to exercise this particular of their duties: holding only so low a rank,—being merely (as their

---

<sup>1</sup> Acts. *ch.* viij. 12. 38.

name imports) servants and ministers,—there was ample authority in the Church to restrain the powers of their office; which, nevertheless, would not cease fully to belong to them, if they disobediently chose unnecessarily to exercise it; for, as I have above said, we cannot discover from the sacred records, that it was not a constant particular of their commission as deacons.

The apostolical canons which plainly speak of the ministers of baptism, are these: “Si quis episcopus, vel presbyter, ex Domini ordinatione non baptizaverit in Patrem, *etc.* deponatur.” And; “Si quis episcopus, vel presbyter non tria unius mysterii baptismata perfecterit, *etc.* deponatur.”<sup>2</sup> I say, “plainly speak,” because other canons have been cited, which seem scarcely to be so relied upon, as the subject of them is not so much the administration of baptism, as the judgment which should be given respecting the validity of baptisms said to have been conferred before:<sup>3</sup> which would not fall within the proper functions of a deacon, but of a priest or bishop.

But, in the constitutions (so called) of the apostles,

<sup>2</sup> Can. xlix. 1.

<sup>3</sup> They are these: the xlvijth: “Episcopus vel presbyter, eum qui vere habet baptismum, si de integro baptizaverit, vel si eum qui ab impiis pollutus est, non baptizaverit, deponatur: *etc.*” and the xlvjth: “Episcopum vel presby-

terum, qui hæreticorum baptismum admiserit, deponi jubemus.” Balsamon’s commentary on the 47th canon, confirms the view which I here take. See Beverege. *Pandect. canon. tom. i. p. 31.* I would not, however, strongly insist upon it.

we find deacons forbidden to baptize in much more express terms: distinguishing, (as Bingham says, quoting one place,) the offices of presbyter and deacon from each other: and, certainly, it does so; though whether this be rather according to the practice of the time, than to the original powers attached to, and inherent in, the respective offices, remains to be determined. We there read: “Presbyter quidem doceat, offerat, baptizet, benedicat populo; diaconus vero ministret episcopo, ac presbyteris; hoc est, ministerium seu diaconatum exerceat; sed non peragat cætera.” Again, without reservation apparently, it must be acknowledged, of any kind, it is declared: “Diaconus non benedicit, non dat benedictionem;—non baptizat; non offert, *etc.*”<sup>4</sup>

In reference to these and similar passages, of which many might be collected from the writings of the primitive ages, I do not think that more can, after all, be reasonably concluded than this: that, very shortly after the days of the apostles themselves, it seemed good to the Church, so to restrain the power of administering baptism, which, by their ordination, deacons possessed, as not to permit it, except in cases of necessity, when a priest or bishop was not at hand. If the

---

<sup>4</sup> *Lib. 3. cap. xx. lib. 8. cap. xxvii.* Bingham likewise appeals to the 11th ch. of the 3rd book, by which, without specifying the deacons (as Cotelerius edits the

text) bishops and priests have authority to baptize, but all the rest of the clergy, lectors, &c., are forbidden.



diaconate, no less than the priesthood, be a divinely instituted order;—if it be true, as the preface to our Ordinal holds, “that from the Apostles’ time there have been these orders of ministers in Christ’s Church; bishops, priests, and deacons;”—then, also of divine institution, there must be certain functions and offices constituting each order, and distinguishing it from the others either above it, or below it.

They who would argue that the right and power to baptize does not form an essential part of the office of a deacon, and yet allow it to be so as regards the priesthood, must rely upon the sacerdotal character of the one as opposed to the other.<sup>5</sup> But there is a very

<sup>5</sup> The schoolmen are tolerably unanimous on this point; see Scotus in iv. sent. disp. xv. *cit.* Card. Lauræa; and the following is the sum of the conclusions of Aquinas: “¶ Dicuntur autem diaconi, quasi ministri: quia videlicet ad diaconos non pertinet aliquod sacramentum principaliter, et quasi ex proprio officio præbere, sed adhibere ministerium aliis majoribus in sacramentorum exhibitione. Et sic ad diaconum non pertinet, quasi ex proprio officio, tradere sacramentum baptismi, sed in collatione hujus sacramenti, et aliorum assistere, et ministrare majoribus. Unde Isidorus, etc. [*in decr. d. 35. c. Perlectis.*] ¶ Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod ad diaconum pertinet recitare evangelium in eccle-

sia, et prædicare ipsum per modum catechizantis:—non sequitur, quod ad diaconos pertineat officium baptizandi. —¶ Ad tertium dicendum, quod quia baptismus est sacramentum necessitatis, permittitur diaconis, necessitate urgente, in absentia majorum baptizare; etc.” *Summa. Pars. III. quæst. lxvij. art. 1.*

In the next article of the same question, is considered; *Utrum baptizare pertineat ad officium presbyterorum.* Upon this Aquinas answers, generally, against the objections; (having shewn that priests are consecrated “ut sacramentum corporis Christi conficiant;”) “¶ Per baptismum aliquis fit particeps ecclesiasticæ unitatis, unde et accipit jus ad

remarkable fact against such a conclusion; and I cannot but insist upon it as an evident proof that the restriction so frequently pressed and enjoined with respect to deacons in the primitive ages was but one of discipline only, justly within the jurisdiction of the Church, and not affecting the inherent rights, and privileges, and duties of the Order. It is this; that in the first instance in which we have any trace of the restriction, we find it applied equally to both priests and deacons. Thus, S. Ignatius writes to the church at Smyrna; “non licet sine episcopo, neque baptizare, neque agapen celebrare: sed quodcunque ille probaverit, hoc et Deo est beneplacitum: ut tutum ratumque

mensam Domini accedendi, et ideo, *sicut ad sacerdotem pertinet consecrare eucharistiam* (ad quod principaliter sacerdotium ordinatur) *ita ad proprium officium sacerdotis pertinet baptizare*; ejusdem enim videtur esse operari totum, et partem in toto disponere. ¶ Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod utrumque officium, scilicet docendi, et baptizandi, Dominus apostolis injunxit, quorum vicem gerunt episcopi: aliter tamen, et aliter. Nam officium docendi commisit eis Christus, ut ipsi per se illud exercerent, tanquam principalissimum: — officium autem baptizandi commisit apostolis, ut per alios exercendum; — et hoc ideo, quia in baptizando nihil operatur meritum, et sapientia ministri,

sicut in docendo, in cujus etiam signum nec ipse Dominus baptizavit, sed discipuli ejus. Nec tamen per hoc excluditur, quia episcopi possint baptizare: quia, quod potest potestas inferior, potest et superior; unde et apostolus ibidem dicit, se quosdam baptizasse. ¶. — Per baptismum non adipiscitur aliquis, nisi infimum gradum in populo Christiano: et ideo baptizare pertinet ad minores principes ecclesiæ, idest ad presbyteros, qui tenent locum septuaginta duorum discipulorum Christi. ¶ Sacramentum baptismi est potissimum necessitate: sed quantum ad perfectionem, sunt quædam alia potiora, quæ episcopis reservantur.” *Ibid.* art. ij.

sit quodcumque agitur.”<sup>6</sup> And Tertullian: “Superest ad concludendam materiolum, de observatione quoque dandi et accipiendi baptismum commonefacere. Dandi quidem habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus; dehinc presbyteri et diaconi; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem; quo salvo, salva pax est.”<sup>7</sup>

Other assertions from the fathers are quoted to the same effect by many writers; especially the following. From S. Ambrose in his treatise on the sacraments: “Adscendisti de fonte, etc. Succinctus summus sacerdos; licet enim et presbyteri fecerint, tamen exordium ministerii à summo est sacerdote.”<sup>8</sup> And from the dialogue of S. Jerome against the Luciferians: “Ecclesiæ salus in summi sacerdotis dignitate pendet.

<sup>6</sup> Epist. ad. Smyrnæos. §. viij. *Coteler. tom. 2. p. 37.*

<sup>7</sup> De baptismo. *cap. 17. Opera. p. 230.*

Bingham appeals to these and other passages, and indeed I would refer the reader to the beginning of his treatise on Lay Baptism, in which the subject is discussed in greater detail, than I either desire or have space to give to it. Among other places, he cites the following from a bishop, an anonymous contemporary of S. Cyprian; which, however, seems to be very doubtful in its application to this argument, as the reader will perceive by a comparison with the con-

text; “Siquidem per nos baptismus tradetur, integre et solemniter et per omnia quæ scripta sunt, adsignetur, atque sine ullius rei separatione tradatur: aut si à minore clero per necessitatem traditum fuerit, eventum expectemus, ut aut suppleatur à nobis, aut à Domino supplendum reservetur.” *Opera S. Cypr. p. 360.*

<sup>8</sup> *Lib. 3. cap. 1. Opera. tom. 2. p. 361.*

The Benedictine editors observe; “usitatum erat istis sæculis, ut episcopus summi sacerdotis, ac episcopatus summi sacerdotii nomine vocarentur.”

—Inde venit, ut sine chrismate et episcopi jussione, neque presbyter, neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi.”<sup>9</sup>

Theologians of the church of Rome are accustomed to distinguish between the right and power of priests and deacons, in their function of administering baptism, to a greater extent than appears to me to be fairly deducible from the testimonies and rules of the primitive ages. They speak of the one as the ordinary and “*ex officio*” minister of baptism: of the other, as extraordinary and by delegation. Thus Tournely says; “*Minister ordinarius et ex officio ille est, qui jure ordinationis suæ et acceptæ à Christo auctoritatis, docendi et baptizandi potestatem habet. Hanc vero duobus modis habere potest, nempe vel sine ulla à superiori dependentia, quales sunt episcopi:—vel cum dependentia et subordinatione ad superiorem, quales sunt simplices sacerdotes, quibus olim baptizare non licebat nisi ex licentia episcoporum: non quidem propter defectum auctoritatis acceptæ in ordinatione sua, sed ad majorem episcopatus honorem et commendationem.—Minister extraordinarius seu ex delegatione ille est, cui, utpote vi ordinationis suæ ad functiones aliquas sacras destinato, jus baptizandi episcopi concedere possunt, quales sunt diaconi.*”<sup>10</sup>

Bellarmin also; “*Catholici doctores communi consensu affirmant; primo, jus baptizandi ex officio ordinario convenire solis sacerdotibus, id est, episcopis et*

---

<sup>9</sup> *Opera. tom. 2. p. 182.*

<sup>10</sup> *De baptismo. p. 272.*

presbyteris, sic tamen, ut presbyteris conveniat cum subordinatione, et dependentia ab episcopis.—Secundo docent, diaconis quoque ex officio convenire baptizare, sed in absentia sacerdotum, aut eorum jussu.”<sup>11</sup>

Still more plainly, the Tridentine catechism ; upon the question “ *Qui proprii sint ministri baptismi.* Doceantur igitur fideles, triplicem est eorum ordinem : ac in primo quidem episcopos et sacerdotes collocandos esse ; quibus datum est, ut jure suo, non extraordinaria aliqua potestate, hoc munus exercean.—Quod vero sacerdotes jure suo hanc functionem exercean, ita ut præsentem etiam episcopo ministrare baptismum possint, ex doctrina patrum et usu ecclesiæ constat.—Quod si aliquando patres sacerdotibus sine episcopi venia, baptizandi jus permissum non esse dixerunt ; id de eo baptismo, qui certis anni diebus solemni cæremonia administrari consueverat, intelligendum videtur. Secundum ministrorum locum obtinent diaconi ; quibus, sine episcopi, aut sacerdotis concessu, non licere hoc sacramentum administrare, plurima sanctorum patrum decreta testantur.”<sup>12</sup>

And, without delaying further upon this, I cannot but add, that Bingham not merely consents to, but goes beyond this position. He says ; “ this point was clear among the ancients, beyond all dispute, that presbyters had only a derivative and subordinate power to baptize as well as others.”<sup>13</sup>

<sup>11</sup> Opera. tom. 2. p. 122.

<sup>12</sup> P. 105. edit. Aldus. 1566.

<sup>13</sup> Lay Baptism. p. 19. Albaspinæus also, in his annotations on



But, as I have already observed, all this seems to me to make too great a distinction between the powers of the episcopate, of the priesthood, and of the diaconate, in the administration of baptism. If it had been said that baptisms administered either by priests or deacons against the declared will of the bishop are irregular, it would have been more correct. For the prohibition which, it is true, was laid upon deacons, it is no less true, was directed also under similar circumstances against priests. If a bishop was present, neither priest nor deacon could baptize, anciently, without his license; and if a priest was present, a deacon was not permitted to baptize. But the prohibition against the performance by either, lay equally against both: and if a priest could baptize by virtue of his orders, so also could a deacon. In neither case was an express permission required, so that the one should act by a continually repeated delegation, as occasions happened, and not the other.<sup>14</sup>

---

certain Gallic councils, at the end of his work on the ancient rites of the Church, takes a similar view: and this, as well with respect to the absolution of penitents, as to baptism. *p.* 415.

<sup>14</sup> Without desiring to press the passage beyond its reasonable bounds, (so as to bear, that is, on lay-baptism,) I think a statement by S. Cyril of Jerusalem, fully

confirms this view: where, speaking of baptism he warns the candidate, "when thou goest to the bishops, or presbyters, or deacons, (for its grace is everywhere, in villages and in cities, on them of low as on them of high degree, on bondsmen and on freemen, for this grace is not of men, but the gift is from God through men,) approach the minister of baptism, but approaching, think not of the

In the first ages of the Church, when adult baptism was the rule rather than, as in later days, the exception; and when there seldom occurred cases of such emergency or necessity as to require the immediate administration of this sacrament; all catechumens were reserved until one of the great festivals appointed for the solemn celebration of holy baptism. Hence it became an office to be especially performed by the bishop himself; and rules and restrictions were found necessary, (as we find from their constant repetition in those times,) in order to restrain this privilege, and prevent the encroachments which were certain to be attempted by priests in the presence of bishops, and by deacons in the presence of both priests and bishops.<sup>15</sup>

Nor has the western Church since the first centuries, at any period, altogether removed the restriction which has thus been directed against the unlimited exercise by deacons of their right to administer bap-

face of him thou seest, but remember that Holy Ghost of whom we are speaking." *Catech.* xvij. §. 35. *Opera.* p. 281. See the note also of the Benedictine editor.

<sup>15</sup> See on this subject Thomas-sin, *de beneficiis, part. 1. lib. 2. cap. xxij.* Van Espen connects the right of priests to baptize with their office as curates of parishes: that office, and with it the power independently, *jure proprio et or-*

*dinario*, of administering solemnly the sacrament of baptism, being still (and truly so far) derived from the bishop. He adds: "Nulli presbytero, diacono, aut clerico, licet baptizare cum consuetis cæremoniis, et extra casum necessitatis in aliqua parochia, sine licentia parochi aut episcopi: quam tamen licentiam episcopus, in præjudicium parochi, nec dare solet, nec facile dare debet." *Jus ecclæs. pars. 11. §. 1. tit. ij.*

tism, in virtue of their orders. This, however, was not always stated in the same manner.

For example, the rituals of the English church, before the revision of her Service-books, in the sixteenth century, did not in the ordinals which were adopted in her various dioceses specify the restriction, but, on the contrary, simply declared this fact: "*Diaconum oportet ministrare ad altare, evangelium legere, baptizare, et prædicare.*"<sup>16</sup> Then, (with the secret saying by the bishop, "*Accipe Spiritum Sanctum,*") after some prayers and a proper Preface, the commission followed to execute this office of a deacon, so largely explained as to its particulars: "*In nomine Sanctæ Trinitatis, accipe stolam immortalitatis: imple ministerium tuum, etc.*"<sup>17</sup>

But from age to age there were continually repeated

<sup>16</sup> Cardinal Cajetan states the argument derived from this admonition in the Latin Ordinal, that in it, the duties of deacons are expressly laid down, both to preach and baptize; and he thus meets it. "*Ad hoc dicitur, quod utrumque verum est diversimode intelligendo. Nam ad diaconos spectat, et baptizare et prædicare ex impositione, hoc est, si ab episcopo, seu presbytero sibi imponatur. Non spectat autem ad diaconos prædicare, aut baptizare ex officio. Ratio quoque literæ solida consistit, fundata super officio diaconi absolute: ex quo enim*

*officium ejus est ministrare, inferitur rationabiliter, quod, si actibus superiorum se immiscet, non nisi ministerialiter ad eos se habet, et propterea recte infertur, non competere sibi ex officio prædicare, aut baptizare, cum quo tamen stat, ut dictum est, quod utrumque potest ei competere ex impositione: hoc enim ostendit ministrum ipsum esse officialium eorum, qui ex officio hæc possunt.*" *Ad Sum. Aquin. pars. III. quæst. lxxij. art. 1.* This answer seems to beg the question.

<sup>17</sup> *Monumenta Ritualia. vol. 3. p. 191. 198.*

canons of diocesan and provincial councils directed to the limitation of this commission: summed up and enforced by the unanimous consent also of the canonists. Thus Hostiensis, on the title, *baptizare quis possit vel debeat*: “Hoc officium ad presbyterum tantum, vel episcopum, et diaconum in necessitate, vel de prædictorum mandato pertinet.”<sup>18</sup> Lyndwood also, in plainer terms: “In casu necessitatis, absente presbytero, potest diaconus suo jure baptizare;—sed in ecclesia præsentē presbytero, non potest, etiamsi necessitas exigat, nisi jussus à presbytero, puta, cum multi sint qui indigent baptismo, et presbyter non potest omnibus sufficere.”<sup>19</sup>

Now, however, in the revised ordinal of our Church, the power to baptize, and the limitation of it, are both expressed in the exposition of the duties of the diaconate, which precedes the act itself of ordination. “It appertaineth to the office of a deacon in the church where he shall be appointed to serve,—in the absence of the priest to baptize infants, *etc.*” And the delivery of the commission follows: “Take thou authority to execute the office of a deacon.”<sup>20</sup>

<sup>18</sup> Summa. lib. III. rubr. xlij.

<sup>19</sup> Lib. 3. tit. 24. Baptisterium habeatur. verb. diaconi.

“De ministro baptismi qualis esse debeat primitus est dicendum. Pro quo nota; quod nullus debet solemniter baptizare in ecclesia, nisi sacerdos: excepto necessitatis articulo. Potest vero diaconus in absentia presbyteri, si

extrema necessitas imminet baptizandi, de jure suo solemniter ut sacerdotes communiter faciunt baptizare.” Pupilla Oculi. pars. 2. cap. ij.

<sup>20</sup> In the Ordinals of 1549, and of 1552, the admonition more nearly followed the examples of the older forms: simply declaring that “it pertaineth to the office

But, whatever the truth may be as regards this question,—whether deacons administer baptism only by a delegated power, and a constantly renewed permission, as many argue; or rather, as it seems to me, in virtue of their orders, though under certain rules and restrictions;—a much more difficult inquiry is that, which is involved in what is called, the validity or the invalidity of lay-baptism.

There are already many excellent treatises written upon both sides of this question, exhausting the arguments both for and against it, and producing almost every known testimony from the fathers and early councils. I shall not therefore think it necessary to enter into it at any length. I propose merely to lay before the reader some of the chief authorities which have been brought forward to prove the validity of lay-baptism in the Catholic Church; and I shall then proceed to consider, in the next chapter, the same question with regard to the church of England, at the period immediately succeeding the reformation, and as her ritual stands at present.

The first direct authority in favour of lay-baptism, is Tertullian. I have already quoted a part of this passage, but it will be well now to repeat it in connexion with what follows. “Dandi[baptismum] quidem

---

of a deacon—to baptize.” The addition inserted at the last Review, in 1662, “in the absence of the priest,” is another among the many instances of the care which

was then taken by the bishops, to return as much as possible to the ancient rules and practices of the Church.



habet jus summus sacerdos, qui est episcopus : dehinc presbyteri et diaconi ; non tamen sine episcopi auctoritate, propter ecclesiæ honorem, quo salvo, salva pax est. Alioquin etiam laicis jus est, quod enim ex æquo accipitur, ex æquo dari potest, nisi episcopi jam, aut presbyteri, aut diaconi vocantur discentes ; Domini sermo non debet abscondi ab ullo. Proinde et baptismus, æque Dei census, ab omnibus exerceri potest : sed quanto magis laicis disciplina verecundiæ et modestiæ incumbit ? cum ea majoribus competant, ne sibi adsumant dicatum episcopis officium episcopatus. *Æmulatio*, schismatum mater est. Omnia licere dixit sanctissimus apostolus, sed non omnia expedire. Sufficiat scilicet, in necessitatibus utaris, sicubi, aut loci, aut temporis, aut personæ conditio compellit. Tunc enim constantia succurrentis excipitur, cum urget circumstantia periclitantis. Quoniam reus erit perditioni hominis, si supersederit præstare quod libere potuit.”<sup>21</sup>

The acknowledged peculiarities of Tertullian’s opinions on various subjects, supply an obvious objection against the correctness of his argument, and the soundness of his conclusion : but the point is not so much here his opinion, as the weight which we are to attribute to him, as evidence to a fact. If about the same time there was a like testimony to the contrary effect ; or if Tertullian’s opinion in this matter had been immediately condemned by the general voice of the Church ; or if, once more, when cited or alluded to by

---

<sup>21</sup> Opera. p. 230.

other writers of little less than equal antiquity, his judgment had been refuted and disowned; we could not but have regarded it, as one of those opinions which were peculiar to himself. So far, however, is it from any thing of this kind, that as Tertullian, so also do other writers when they speak of lay-baptism at all, speak of it as being valid, in cases of necessity.<sup>22</sup>

Reminding the reader of the famous case of the boys, baptized by S. Athanasius, also at that time a boy, in their play upon the sea-shore,<sup>23</sup> I shall pass on

<sup>22</sup> We may echo the words of Hooker; speaking of his own time: "Yea, 'Baptism by any man in case of necessity' was the voice of the whole world heretofore." *Ecc. Polity. book 5. ch. lxj. §. 3.*

<sup>23</sup> It will be well however to give the account of it in a note, in the words of an historian who declares that he received the story from those who had conversed with S. Athanasius. "Tempore, quo apud Alexandriam, Petri martyris diem Alexander episcopus agebat, quum post expleta solennia conventuros ad convivium suum clericos expectaret in loco mari vicino: videt eminus puerorum supra oram maris ludum imitantium, ut fieri solet, episcopum, atque ea quæ in ecclesia geri mos est. Sed quum intentius diutine pueros inspectaret, videt ab his geri quædam etiam secretiora et

mystica. Perturbatus illico vocari ad se clericos jubet, atque eis, quid eminus ipse videret, ostendit. Tum abire eos et comprehensos ad se perducere omnes pueros imperat. Quumque adessent, quis eis ludus, et quid egissent, vel quomodo, percunctatur. Illi, ut talis habet ætas, pavidum, negare primo, deinde rem gestam per ordinem pandunt, et baptizatos à se esse quosdam catechumenos confitentur per Athanasium, qui ludi illius puerilis episcopus fuerat simulatus. Tum ille diligenter inquirens ab his, qui baptizati dicebantur, quid interrogati fuerint, quidve responderint, simul et ab eo, qui interrogaverat. Ubi videt, secundum religionis nostræ ritum cuncta constare, conlocutus cum concilio clericorum, statuisset traditur, illis, quibus integris interrogationibus et responsionibus aqua fuerit infusa, iterari baptis-

at once to the statements of S. Augustine. There are two places usually appealed to in his works. The one is. “Etsi laicus aliquis pereunti dederit [baptismum] necessitate compulsus, quod cum ipse acciperet quomodo dandum esset addidicit, nescio an pie quisquam dixerit esse repetendum. Nulla enim cogente necessitate si fiat, alieni muneris usurpatio est: si autem necessitas urgeat, aut nullum, aut veniale delictum est. Sed etsi nulla necessitate usurpetur, et à quolibet cuilibet detur, quod datum fuerit non potest dici non datum, quamvis recte dici possit illicite datum.”<sup>24</sup>

It has been argued against this passage that S. Augustine is only allowing a doubt: but the fair interpretation to be put upon his words, and the expression “nescio an pie quisquam dixerit,” especially in connexion with what follows, is, not that he doubted what the truth was, but that so far as an individual he might do so, he is giving a decision upon the matter. And there can be no such objection made against the passage which I am now about to quote, and which is the more remarkable, as an evidence of his own opinion, inasmuch as he declares that the question itself had never been defined by a general council. In inquiring therefore into the sense in which we ought to understand S. Augustine in his treatise against Parmenian, we must not fail to remember what he has

---

mum non debere, sed adimpleri  
ea quæ a sacerdotibus mos est.”  
Ruffin. Hist. lib. 1. c. xiv.

<sup>24</sup> Contra epist. Parmeniani.  
lib. 2. §. 29. Opera. tom. ix. p.  
43.

also said in other parts of his works. "Sed nobis tutum est," are his words, "in ea non progredi aliqua temeritate sententiæ, quæ nullo in catholico regionali concilio cœpta, nullo plenario terminata sunt: id autem fiducia securæ vocis asserere, quod in gubernatione Domini Dei nostri et Salvatoris Jesu Christi, universalis ecclesiæ consensione roboratum est. Verumtamen si quis forte me in eo concilio constitutum, ubi talium rerum quæstio versaretur, non præcedentibus talibus, quorum sententias sequi mallet, urgeret ut dicerem quid ipse sentirem: si eo modo affectus essem, quo eram cum ista dictarem, nequaquam dubitarem habere eos baptismum, qui ubicunque, et à quibuscumque illud verbis evangelicis consecratum, sine sua simulatione, et cum aliqua fide accepissent." <sup>25</sup>

Also there is this place in S. Jerome's dialogue against the Luciferians; forming part of a passage which I have already cited. "Sine chrismate et episcopi jussione, neque presbyter neque diaconus jus habeant baptizandi. Quod frequenter, si tamen necessitas cogit, scimus etiam licere laicis." <sup>26</sup>

---

<sup>25</sup> De baptismo. *lib.* vij. §. 102. *ibid.* p. 202.

It must also be noticed, that this passage, which as a mere extract appears sufficiently to the purpose, carries with it far greater weight, when considered with its context. And the student will do well to examine carefully the last sections of this treatise *de baptis-*

*mo*: he will observe that S. Augustine is discussing lay-baptism not simply in cases of necessity, but under other and more exceptionable circumstances.

<sup>26</sup> Opera. *tom.* 2. p. 182.

In the commentary of Remigius, a bishop, (before the year 500) on the first epistle to the Corinthians, *ch.* 1. v. 17, we read:—"in pri-

Having transcribed these, the first notices which are to be found in the fathers upon this subject, I must refer the reader who desires to examine later evidences and authorities, from like sources, to the common books in which they may be found collected: especially to Bingham's scholastical history of lay-baptism, on the one hand, and to Laurence's tracts, upon the other. I think, however, that I ought here to add the earliest conciliar decision of any branch of the Church.

This is the very famous canon of the council of Eliberis (Elvira in Spain) about the year 304. "Peregre navigantes, aut si ecclesia in proximo non fuerit, posse fidelem, qui lavacrum suum integrum habet, nec sit bigamus, baptizare in necessitate infirmitatis positum catechumenum: ita ut si supervixerit, ad episcopum eum perducatur, ut per manus impositionem proficere possit."<sup>27</sup> Now, whatever restrictions this canon im-

---

mordio enim fidei omnes fideles baptizabant, et non solum viri, sed etiam mulieres, si quando necessitas imminebat. Sed ne tantum ministerium vilesceret, aut non recte a simplicioribus completur, crescente numero fidelium per universas civitates, et villas, decretum est, ut tantum episcopi, et presbyteri baptizent, et, si necessitas fuerit, diaconi." *Bibl. Patrum. tom. 8. p. 948.*

<sup>27</sup> *Concil. Mansi. tom. 2. col. 12. can. xxxviii.*

The words "qui lavacrum suum integrum habet," have been variously understood. Bingham, following Vossius, supposes that they relate to clinic baptism: but Albaspinæus refers them, as I have in the text, to cases of lapse after baptism. Independently of other post-baptismal sins, the days of persecution had not passed away, when the council of Eliberis was held: and the occurrence of a denial of the faith was one very likely, and with justice, to fall



posed upon the administration of baptism by lay-persons,—and it is clear that there are several, viz: that it should be in cases only of necessity, and not by bigamists, nor by those whose own baptism had been defiled by after lapse,—yet the fact remains, that under certain circumstances such baptisms were to be recognized as valid.

In short, it must be acknowledged, that since the fourth century, every notice respecting the administration of baptism by lay-persons tends to prove, that in cases of necessity it was not only to be recognized, but to be considered regular. We cannot suppose, if before the fourth century lay baptism was not only irregular but invalid, that at that time, when the practice of the apostolic age was so well remembered and consented to, a change so great, in a sacrament instituted by our Blessed Lord, could have been either introduced or permitted. The fathers of the Catholic Church knew well that baptism is necessary to salvation; they knew well that “except a man be born again of water and of the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven;” but they knew no less the certain truth, that the Church could not extend, without a new revelation from the same Divine Source, the bounds and limits within which those blessings were to be conveyed and received. If therefore our

---

within its contemplation. The commentary of Albaspinæus is attached to the edition of the councils by Mansi: who, in a footnote

to the canon adds; “Cyprianus *epist.* 52, et Pacianus *epist.* 3. integros sacerdotes vocant, non lapsos.”

Blessed Lord had so tied down the administration of this sacrament, that it should not be valid except at the hands of a bishop, priest, or deacon;—and this was a fact only to be learnt from the practice and teaching of the apostles themselves;—it is not to be conceived that within so short a period, such a change as lay-baptism would have involved, affecting the very essence of the sacrament, could have been ventured on by the Church.

Take the example of the other great sacrament, the Holy Eucharist. Equally well-known to, and insisted on by, the primitive Church, was this doctrine also: that “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you.” And yet, because the partaking of the Communion was so necessary to eternal salvation, we cannot discover the least trace of any permission, that, where the presence of a priest could not be obtained, or however urgent the necessity, a layman might consecrate the bread and wine, and make them the Body and the Blood of Christ. Far from it: the Church repeatedly prohibited all such impious intrusions upon the sacerdotal office; acknowledging the absolute necessity of the reception (where it might be had) of the Body and the Blood of her Lord, she nevertheless where such reception was impossible, because there was not a priest to consecrate, committed the event in humble reverence and faith to His decision and infinite mercy, Who had instituted the sacrament. Nor do I believe, if there had been the same strict rule from the beginning, with

regard to the sacrament of baptism, that any relaxation of it, to so great an extent as permitting lay-administration, could possibly have been, as I have already said, either introduced or allowed.

Much stress has been laid by the advocates and the opponents of lay-baptism, upon the known fact of the allowance of schismatical baptism, in the case of the Novatians, by the Nicene council. Bingham argues, and I think with much justice, that the Novatian clergy were not only degraded, but, continuing so, to all intents became and were regarded as laymen:<sup>28</sup> Laurence and Waterland insist upon this recognition of such heretical or schismatical baptism having been based upon the indelible character of orders, which still remained with the Novatian and Arian clergy. This is a question which would open far too wide a field of discussion now to enter upon; and it must be sufficient for me to refer the reader to Laurence's tracts, and to Waterland's two letters to Kelsall, where he will find all that can reasonably be urged against the view taken by Bingham of the decrees, in such cases, by the early councils.

There was lately published an edition of Laurence's tracts, with a very excellent preface by Mr. Scott, the editor, who supports strongly the invalidity of lay-baptism, unless it rests upon a direct commission, given by the Church herself from time to time. I must quote his remarks upon the precedent of the

---

<sup>28</sup> Lay-baptism. *Part. 2. ch. 1. etc.*

Novatians, in which the argument from it is stated in clear terms, and its importance fully recognized.

“Baptisms,” he observes, “in the ancient church, though administered by schismatics, such as the Novatians, &c. or by heretics, such as the Macedonians or Arians, were allowed; for in all these cases the priests were priests, and not laymen—they had the succession—they had the sacerdotal right—they had the indelible character. This indeed may be marked as the *jugulum causæ*.” Bingham, as I have above said, denies this:<sup>29</sup> and Mr. Scott having remarked on it,

<sup>29</sup> Compare bishop Jeremy Taylor: *Of the Office Ministerial*. Works, vol. 14. p. 443. Where he speaks doubtfully upon the point whether, “heretical bishops being deposed and reduced into lay-communion, could not therefore collate baptism for their want of holy orders.”

This part of the tract of the very learned bishop was written to disprove the validity of lay-baptism: but, as it appears to me, the question in dispute is begged throughout: as, in the beginning of the section, he says, “if the laity may be admitted to the dispensation” of this sacrament, “there is nothing in the calling of the clergy that can distinguish them from the rest of God’s people.” But not to instance in the consecration of the Blessed Eu-

charist, this is almost an absurd consequence. So, again, having truly and in his nervous way of writing said, “he that worships God with a sin, shall be thanked with a damnation,” he hastily concludes that baptizing infants is “a breach of a Divine institution.” As to adults, the bishop declares it to be “certain that, for persons having the use of reason, God hath provided a remedy that no lay-person should have need to baptize a catechumen; for his *votum* or *desire* of baptism shall serve his turn.” But *supposing* this to be in some cases certain; at least, it will not hold, in all cases, until it be proved that lay-administration, in necessity, is both invalid and sinful. For if it be not so, and persons are present (though neither priests nor dea-

goes on to say, that such denial “must rest on the assumption that there is no indelible character in the priesthood, and that heresy nulls orders, and as a consequence all subsequent ministerial acts. This settles the question of primitive precedent; whichever way this matter is decided, lay-baptism follows with it.” Again, in language which I am glad to quote, although I cannot consent to the argument; “Admitting the practice in certain cases of lay-baptism, and granting the validity of ancient schismatical baptisms, when we inquire for that common nature which, in spite of their irregularity, rendered them acceptable in the eyes of the Church, we have seen that it is *the commission*. Wherever this existed, however surreptitiously obtained, or disobediently, even sinfully, preserved, the ancient Church confessed the divine presence, and with mournful reverence refused to interfere.”<sup>30</sup>

All this would be difficult to disprove, if it were not true, both, that the primitive Church recognized and permitted baptism where no pretence of orders could be suggested; and, that in the case of the Novatians and Arians, their baptisms were allowed by the council, without any reference or allusion whatsoever being made to the fact of their “being priests,” or still “having the succession.” We know that both those sects, (the one schismatical, the other heretical also)

---

cons), then the mere *desire* of baptism, can and ought to be supplied by the actual reception: for

there no longer remains that exception “where it cannot be had.”

<sup>30</sup> Preface. p. xxv. xxviiij.



used in their administration of the sacrament of baptism, the proper matter, and the proper form: we know that these were two essentials required from the beginning by the Catholic Church: we know that baptism administered by laics was accounted valid: why then should we look for any other reasons, after all arbitrary and to support a theory, in order that the recognition of Novatian baptisms by the Nicene fathers might not run counter to new opinions? Surely, if indeed those baptisms were admitted, because the administrators had, at some previous time, received imposition of hands and an indelible character in ordination, it is not too much for us to have expected, that such a reason would have been distinctly declared by the council, as the ground of their decision. Even for this cause, if for none other, that they might not erroneously be supposed to rest upon the same foundation as the lay-baptisms which from the apostolic age, to the best of our belief, have always been accounted valid.<sup>31</sup>

I cannot but conclude, therefore, that baptisms have always been reputed valid in the Catholic Church, that is, they were both recognized and forbidden to be repeated, provided only that they had been conferred

---

<sup>31</sup> It does not follow that we must deny "the indelible character" of orders, because we do not allow that baptisms administered by degraded priests, or by schismatics who possibly still retain, in

some way, the succession, are to be referred to that cause for their validity. If such was a necessary consequence, it would not be easy to shew why re-ordinations are unlawful.

with the proper matter and the proper form: and that the minister is not the essence of the sacrament. He is, truly perhaps, of the essence "of the right and lawful ministry of the sacrament," as K. James said at the Hampton Court conference; but then he may equally be the right and lawful minister, whether clerk or lay. This difference must depend upon the necessity of the case, in which such ministration is required. The validity of the baptism, in all instances, will be the same, but not the "rightfulness," or, regularity. And, it will follow that whilst in some instances a baptism administered by a layman or even by a deacon, would be (not invalid, but) irregular, in another instance a baptism administered by a woman, would be both valid and regular.<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> Bingham seems to doubt the "regularity" under any circumstances of baptisms administered by women. He says "the stress of the question lies in this, whether the ancient Church allowed women to baptize in extraordinary cases of extreme necessity, as she did laymen? And here, I think, with submission to better judgments, she did not.—In the fourth council of Carthage, women are absolutely forbidden to baptize, without any exception. [*'Mulier baptizare non præsumat.' can. 100.*] Nor does S. Jerom, nor S. Austin, nor Gelasius, nor Isidore, grant any authority to wo-

men to baptize, as they do to men.—But it will be demanded further, whether if women usurped the authority of baptizing,—was their baptism repeated as null and void, or received as valid by the Church?—as I remember no ancient author that has spoken directly and closely to this part of the question; and there are some reasons to believe that S. Austin believed it was not to be rejected; so I leave this to the judgment of others, and further inquiry." *Lay-bapt. part. 1. ch. 1. §. xvij.*

Agreeing, as I do, with Bingham in the general conclusion at which he has arrived upon this

In admitting the validity of baptism by women, it is at once evident that the extreme of the case before

---

whole question, I yet cannot pass on without reminding the reader of the principle, if we may so speak of it, from which he starts in his enquiry, and insists upon, as enforcing the inevitable necessity of the correctness of his conclusion. A principle unworthy of any one, who could claim but a tithe of the reputation which is justly due to him for learning and moderation: instructive, however, as evidencing the extremes into which men will sometimes be driven, by prejudice and (I fear, in this case) by political considerations of the most miserable kind.

Bingham does not hesitate to assert, that "the whole church of England, and all the churches of the reformation, have the very essence and being of their baptism and christianity depending upon the validity of baptism administered by heretical and schismatical clergy. For they all received their baptism from the heretical and schismatical church of Rome. According, therefore, as heretical and schismatical baptism is determined to be valid or not valid, such must be the fate of these churches, *etc.*" *part. 1. ch. 1. §. 19.* Compare the appendix. *p. 139.* Such an argument is really too contemptible for consideration.

It is true that baptism by women was frequently forbidden by early decisions of the church. The fourth council of Carthage has been mentioned above; and a like prohibition is in the apostolical constitutions, *lib. 3. c. 9.* But these, and similar expressions of prohibition which are to be found in Tertullian, and other fathers, cannot justly be pressed beyond a condemnation of certain heretics, such as the Marcionites, the Pepuzians, and the Collyridians, who admitted the ministry of women not only in baptism but in other sacred offices. Or, they might have reference to the intrusion of women unnecessarily into the administration of this sacrament.

With regard especially to the 100th canon of the fourth council of Carthage, an addition is given by Gratian, *can. mulier, de consecr. dist. 4.* "nisi necessitate cogente." Peter Lombard adopts the same reading. *Senten. lib. 4. dist. 6.* and Pamelius in his notes upon Tertullian *de bapt. c. xvij,* concludes it to have been formerly the true text of the canon. But the editions by Labbè and Mansi do not admit it: nor, as both Bingham and Vossius remark, did Walafrid Strabo in his time so read it: but they do not add, that

us is conceded: nor do I see why such baptisms are to be rejected, if we once allow that baptisms by any layman whatsoever are to be recognized. It seems to be an unavoidable consequence that we should allow the one, if we do not deny the other. Necessity has always been regarded by the Church, as a fit reason why men, neither priests nor deacons, should baptize: and if the same necessity exists, where no man happens to be at hand, what is there, in the nature of the thing, which should prevent the administration of this sacrament by a woman? Doubtless, it must be ventured upon, only

---

Strabo very shortly after he has cited the canon, in effect admits the addition, declaring; “ubi inevitabilis necessitas poscit, melius baptizari ubicunque et a quocunque in nomine Trinitatis, quam periclitantem sine remedio deperire.”

The midwives, licensed as they were in the church of England for so long a period,—a practice indeed, as the diocesan visitation articles will show, continued until the eighteenth century, — have some kind of similitude to the ancient deaconesses. Morinus, *de S. Ordin. pars. III. exercit. x.* Calvör, *rit. eccles. lib. 1. sect. 2. cap. xxvj.* Albaspinæus, *observat. lib. 1. 24.* and many others have explained the functions of that ancient order: and the more modern midwives were required to be appointed, as they had been, by ecclesiastical authority: to be also

of mature age and of an honest conversation. No small part also of the duties of the primitive deaconesses consisted in their ministrations before and at the period of conferring baptism: they not only were qualified to administer the sacrament in times of urgent necessity, but they instructed the female catechumens, and prepared them, in the baptistery, to receive immersion. I must quote the 12th canon of the famous 4th council of Carthage. “Viduæ vel sanctionales, quæ ad ministerium baptizandarum mulierum eliguntur, tam instructæ sint ad officium, ut possint apto et sano sermone docere imperitas et rusticas mulieres, tempore quo baptizandæ sunt, qualiter baptizatori interrogatæ respondeant, et qualiter accepto baptismate vivant.” Mansi. *Concil. tom. 3. col. 952.*

in the last extremity,—if I may so speak, only when life appears to be fast ebbing away, and no hope left,—but so also, until a like extremity, (whatever may be said as to its validity) all lay-baptism, by any person male or female, is equally to be deferred so long as it justly may, under the penalty to be incurred by the administrator of high irregularity and sin.

The argument which would have chief weight against baptism by women, is that which has been over and over again insisted on by its opponents, namely, their utter want of fitness for exercising such an office, under any circumstances, or, however pressing the necessity might be. But this unfitness, reaching to such an extent, has not been proved: and proved it ought to be, so as to annul all the testimonies which may be brought in favour of their fitness, from the general voice of the Church for many centuries, and the absence, in all ages even from the beginning, of any direct and plain assertion that baptisms by women, are, because by women, invalid and to be repeated. In all such cases of necessity, not the most proper minister, but some minister, is required: and, whether male or female, the Church regards the person who administers as simply the instrument: so S. Augustin has written; “*Petrus baptizet; hic est [Christus] qui baptizet: Paulus baptizet; hic est, qui baptizat: Judas baptizet; hic est qui baptizat.*”<sup>33</sup> It may be, also, to

---

<sup>33</sup> In Joan. *tract.* vj. n. 7.



the same effect, S. Paul: "Ye are all the children of God, by faith in Christ Jesus. For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>34</sup> Galat. c. iij. v. 28.

## CHAPTER IX.



MUST now, in the present chapter, direct the reader's attention to a question which ought to be carefully considered ; namely, what is the present rule of our Church, with regard to the validity of lay-baptism. As a necessary prelude to this enquiry I shall have to produce some of the numerous decisions which, in former ages from time to time, the church of England has given, and the opinion of her greatest canonists and divines. Her present rule, if it be indeed various from her old rule, must, of course, be collected from her ritual and formularies, which have been issued and authorised during the last three centuries. Very probably many of my readers know that lay-baptism was fully recognized in our Church before the reformation ; but scarcely perhaps that such administration was earnestly insisted upon, in all cases of necessity. Moreover, the extracts which I shall make will prove far better than mere assertions, how unanimous and constant the judgment of the church of England, when she has explained it, has ever been in this matter.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> How requisite such a production of evidence is, may be shewn from the following passage in a writer who has certainly examined

But, before I proceed to this, I shall take one or two places from the general body of the canon-law, which shew the judgment also of the whole western Church during the middle ages, and the rules by which the practice of all her provinces was directed. Thus, a rescript of Urban II. in the eleventh century: “Super quibus consulit nos tua dilectio, hoc videtur nobis ex sententia respondendum: ut et baptismus sit, si instante necessitate femina puerum in nomine Trinitatis baptizaverit; *etc.*”<sup>2</sup>

Again; citing S. Augustin; “In necessitate cum episcopi, aut presbyteri, aut quilibet ministrorum non inveniuntur, et urget periculum ejus, qui petit, ne sine isto sacramento hanc vitam finiat, etiam laicos solere dare sacramentum, quod acceperunt, solemus audire.”<sup>3</sup>

And, without extracting other passages, it will be sufficient to give a part of the famous decree or instruction of Eugenius IV. to the Armenians; summing up, as it were, the definitions of preceding councils: “In causa necessitatis non solum sacerdos vel diaconus, sed etiam laicus vel mulier—baptizare potest, dummodo

the question with some care; unless he is to be understood to believe that the church of England was founded in the sixteenth century: an assertion which, I presume, he would repudiate. “It is well known,” he says, “that our Church has never *directly* pronounced any decided judgment upon this subject; that her opinion

s to be *drawn* from the evidence of *indirect* testimony.” *Dissenters’ baptisms*, &c. p. 49. The italics are his own. A page or two further on this statement is qualified and explained.

<sup>2</sup> Decret. pars. II. causa. 30. qu. iij.

<sup>3</sup> *De consecr. dist.* IV. 21.

formam servet ecclesiæ, et facere intendat quod facit ecclesia.”<sup>4</sup>

In producing the testimony of the English church, I shall content myself as regards the Anglo-saxon age, with citing two or three places from the peniten-

<sup>4</sup> Concil. Mansi. tom. xxxj. col. 1055.

To the above extracts from the body of the canon-law, it is desirable to add the opinion of Aquinas, representing that, generally, of the schoolmen; so that, with the canonists, the reader will be able to learn the judgment constantly acted on by the mediæval Church.

“Inter omnia autem sacramenta maximæ necessitatis est baptismus, qui est regeneratio hominis in vitam spiritualem: quia pueris aliter omnino subveniri non potest, et adulti non possunt aliter, quam per baptismum plenam remissionem consequi, et quantum ad culpam, et quantum ad pœnam. ¶ Et ideo, ut homo circa remedium tam necessarium defectum pati non possit, institutum est, ut et materia baptismi sit communis, scilicet aqua, et minister baptismi etiam sit quicumque non ordinatus, ne propter defectum baptismi homo salutis suæ dispendium patiatur. ¶ Ergo dicendum, quod baptizare pertinet ad ordinem sacerdotalem secundum quandam convenientiam, et

solemnitatem: non autem hoc est de necessitate sacramenti, unde etiamsi extra necessitatis articulum laicus baptizet, peccat quidem: tamen sacramentum baptismi confert: nec est rebaptizandus ille, qui sic est baptizatus.”

“*Utrum mulier possit baptizare.* Respondeo dicendum, quod Christus est, qui principaliter baptizat.—¶ Quia tamen caput mulieris est vir, non debet mulier baptizare, si adsit copia viri.—¶ Ad secundum dicendum quod quando baptismus solemniter et ordinarie celebratur, debet aliquis sacramentum baptismi suscipere à presbytero curam animarum habente, vel ab aliquo vice ejus: hoc tamen non requiritur in articulo necessitatis, in quo potest mulier baptizare.—Si tamen mulier etiam extra casum necessitatis baptizaret, non esset rebaptizandus; peccaret tamen ipsa baptizans, et alii qui ad hoc cooperarentur, vel baptismum ab ea suscipiendo, vel ei baptizandum aliquem offerendo.” *Summa. Pars. III. quest. lxvij. art. 3. 4.* Compare Scotus, *Sentent. lib. iv. dist. vj. qu. 1. Reportat. Paris. lib. vi. dist. vj.*

tial of archbishop Theodore, which brings us up almost to the period itself of the conversion under S. Augustin, Theodore being but the seventh in succession from him. He lays down the restriction, “ Si quis baptizat pro temeritate, non ordinatus, abjiciendus extra ecclesiam, et nunquam ordinetur.” Presently after, the rule ; “ Omnibus fidelibus licet, ubi forte morituros invenerint non baptizatos, necessitate cogente, baptizare ; immo præceptum est animas eripere a diabolo per baptismum, id est, benedicta<sup>5</sup> simpliciter aqua, in nomine Domini, baptizare illos, in Nomine Patris, *etc.* intinctos aut superfusos aqua.” This again is explained, by the very limitation added in a succeeding chapter, to extend to women. “ Mulier baptizare non præsumat, nisi cogente necessitate maxima.”<sup>6</sup>

At the period of the conquest, archbishop Lanfranc, in one of his epistles, plainly asserts the practice : “ Infantem quoque non baptizatum, si morte imminente urgeatur, à fidei laico, si presbyter desit, baptizari posse canones præcipiunt, nec eum tamen, si statim moriatur, à consortio fidelium sejungunt.”<sup>7</sup>

In the following centuries the councils repeat the same injunction, rather than permission. The council at London in the year 1200 ; “ Si vero in necessitate puer baptizetur a laico, quod fieri potest a patre vel a matre, absque matrimonii præjudicio, sequentia immer-

---

On the proper interpretation to be put upon this, see the remarks above, *p.* 94.

<sup>6</sup> *Cap.* xxxviij. 4. xliij. 3. xlvij.

21. Thorpe, *Ancient Laws and Institutes*, vol. 2.

<sup>7</sup> *Opera.* *p.* 317. Wilkins, *Concilia.* tom. 1. *p.* 361.



sionem non præcedentia per sacerdotem expleantur.” The provincial constitutions at Oxford, under Stephen Langton: “Sub eadem forma, [Baptizo te, *etc.*] in lingua quam melius noverint, doceant frequenter sacerdotes, laicos baptizare debere pueros in necessitate, et mulieres, et patrem et matrem pueri in summa necessitate.” The constitutions of the diocese of Coventry, in 1237; “Item præcipimus, quod quilibet sacerdos parochianos suos baptizare pueros suos in necessitate secundum formam ecclesiæ, super his verbis; Ego baptizo te. *N. etc.* Et ista eadem forma dicendi servetur in Gallico sermone et in Anglico.” A synodal statute of the diocese of Norwich, in the same century, to a like effect; “Sacerdotes—formam baptizandi doceant frequenter laicos in idiomate communi.” The legatine constitutions of Othobon, in the year 1268, confirming the preceding and corresponding one of Otho thirty years before; “Quia vero multorum simplicitas in baptismi collatione deficeret, cum necessitatis articulus immineret, nisi à ministris Christianæ fidei docerentur, à prædicto legato invenimus provide constitutum, ut parochiales presbyteri, formam baptismi firmiter addiscentes, eam parochianis suis frequenter exponant diebus dominicis<sup>8</sup> in vulgari; ut si articulus necessitatis emergat, in quo oporteat per ipsos aliquem

---

<sup>8</sup> “*Diebus dominicis.* Nam tunc communius conveniunt populi ad ecclesiam, et juxta morem patriæ de cæteris agendis pro ani-

marum suarum salute, tunc curiosius instruuntur.” J. de Athon. *in const. Othonis.* Ad baptismum. Compare Anc. Lit. p. 50. note 59.

baptizari, eam sciant et valeant observare.” The famous synod of Exeter, in 1287; “ Sacerdotibus, quibus cura animarum incumbit, districte præcipimus, quod formam baptizandi parochianis suis exponant sæpius in vulgari; videlicet, quod tempore partus aquam habeant promptam, in quam, si oportuerit, baptizandum parochiani immergant, dicentes; Ego te baptizo, *etc.* Sæpius enim accidit, quod propter mortis periculum per alium quam per sacerdotem oportebit parvulum baptizari.” And, once more, the articles of visitation for the diocese of London, in 1554, inquire; “ Whether they [the curates] have diligently moved and exhorted their parishioners, how and in what manner children should be baptized in time of necessity?”<sup>9</sup>

Having thus seen the decisions of the English councils, let us turn to her canonists.

Hostiensis is very brief: “ Necessitate etiam instante, quilibet et quælibet potest baptizare: et si quis in necessitate baptizaverit, debeat postea baptizatus deportari ad sacerdotem, qui quærit, quæ forma ser-

<sup>9</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia. tom. I. p. 505. 594. 642. 732. tom. II. p. 2. 131. tom. IV. p. 106. Cf. tom. I. p. 636. 656. Reformatio Angliæ. decret. ij. p. 7. vers. edit. 1562.*

On the restrictions laid upon deacons compare also the *Concilia, tom. I. p. 501. 576.*

The notorious John Bale published a “ declaration ” of the Ar-

ticles of Visitation last cited in the text above: in which he does not omit to object against this inquiry, as to the care taken by the parish-priests in teaching their people how to baptize properly in times of necessity. He writes in his usual scurrilous style, and utter carelessness of all truth. *fol. 71.* The .xx. Article.

vata est, et secundum quod audiet, vel iterum baptizabit, vel supplebit quod est omisum.”<sup>10</sup>

Lyndwood says: “ In quo casu [in mortis periculo] satis licet laico vel patri proprium filium baptizare: et baptismus in hoc casu per laicum factus, alias tamen rite, bene tenet; et sufficit ad salvationem. Sic etiam in mortis periculo licet aliquid facere, quod alias non liceret.”<sup>11</sup> *A laicis baptizati.* i. e. His qui nullum ordinem receperunt in ecclesia.—et nota, quod id quod hic dicitur de laico, sc. quod potest in casu necessitatis baptizare, locum habet a fortiori a quocumque etiam clerico citra ordinem presbyteratus. Unde pro vero teneas, quod extra casum necessitatis, solus sacerdos est debitus minister ad sacramentum baptismi. Et peccaret mortaliter aliquis non sacerdos baptizans, præterquam in articulo mortis. Si tamen de facto baptizaret aliquis non sacerdos extra articulum necessitatis, cum tamen debita intentione, et in forma ecclesiæ, tenet baptismus ad effectum quod sic baptizatus non debet rebaptizari. Et idem dico de non baptizato baptizante: quia bonitas sive sanctitas ministri non est de necessitate baptismi, sed de congruentia.”<sup>12</sup>

Again: upon this clause in the constitution of archbishop Edmund; *si vero puer a laico domi propter ne-*

<sup>10</sup> Summa. lib. III. rubr. xlij. 3.

<sup>11</sup> Lyndwood refers here to the Decretum, *de consecr. dist.* iv. where in two or three chapters the case of catechumens is considered, and license given to bap-

tize them if necessary, at other than the solemn seasons of baptism, viz: Easter, and Whitsuntide. §. xv. xvj. xvij.

<sup>12</sup> Lib. I. tit. 7. Quod in constitutione.

*cessitatem fuerit baptizatus.*<sup>13</sup> “*Domi.* sc. ubi natus est puer, vel in alio loco quam in baptisterio ad hoc deputato.<sup>14</sup>—*Propter necessitatem.* Quia forsitan timetur de ejus morte imminente, quo casu cuilibet licet baptizare, etiam patri. Unde et hæreticus tempore necessitatis potest baptizare, dum tamen cum intentione baptizandi servet formam ecclesiæ. Et non solum potest esse necessitas in periculo mortis, sed etiam quia in partibus est hostilitas, vel incursus latronum, aut inundatio aquarum, vel quid simile in via vel in loco, vel damnum pecuniarium: ut si sub pœna pecuniaria esset prohibitum, ne quis ad talem locum accederet. Scias tamen, quod laicus sine necessitate baptizans peccat;—et quod licet presbyter baptizare possit, præsentem episcopo, quia de officio suo est; tamen præsentem presbytero clericus baptizare non debet, nec laicus præsentem clerico, nec mulier præsentem viro.”<sup>15</sup>

<sup>13</sup> *Lib. III. tit. 24.* Baptisterium habeatur.

<sup>14</sup> “Et nota, quod extra ecclesias, ubi sunt fontes baptismales deputati, regulariter non licet aliquem baptizare: fallit tamen in liberis regum vel principum, vel ubi talis necessitas emergerit, propter quam nequeat ad ecclesiam absque periculo accessus haberi.” *ibid. verb.* Domi. See the remarks above, p. 173.

<sup>15</sup> So, and more fully, the old rubric of the Sarum and York manuals: “Si vero vir et mulier adessent ubi immineret necessi-

tatis articulus baptizandi puerum, et non esset alius minister ad hoc magis idoneus præsens, vir baptizet et non mulier, nisi forte mulier bene sciret verba sacramentalia et non vir, vel aliud impedimentum subesset. ¶ Similiter pater vel mater non debet proprium filium de sacro fonte levare nec baptizare, nisi in extremæ necessitatis articulo, tunc enim bene possunt sine præjudicio copulæ conjugalibus ipsum baptizare, nisi fuerit aliquis alius præsens qui hoc facere sciret et vellet.”

It is not, (perhaps I ought to

I pass on to the *Pupilla oculi*. “In ardua necessitate, quilibet homo, sive clericus sive laicus; baptiza-

say it has not been) unusual for English priests to baptize their own children, as an office especially suitable to themselves: in what way suitable, I am quite at a loss to discover, even if it rested only on their own opinions of suitability; but, at any rate, to perform such an office, except in a case of necessity, displays, if not a forgetfulness of the doctrine and mystery of the Sacrament, at least a most marvellous ignorance of all ecclesiastical rule. I have heard of a late instance in the diocese of Bath and Wells, (not, however, during the episcopacy of the present bishop nor of his predecessor,) where the parish-priest, during divine service, married himself: and, if it were not for the probable impossibility, it would scarcely be too much,—judging from analogous examples of carelessness about propriety, and canonical restrictions,—to expect that sometimes our clergy would try to bury themselves.

The invalidity of a baptism (already alluded to incidentally, see above, *p.* 123, and *p.* 134. *note* 41.) administered, in extreme urgency, to a person by himself, is a question which has been decided by the canon-law: “Sane intimasti, quod quidam Judæus in mortis

articulo constitutus, cum inter Judæos tantum existeret, in aquam seipsum immersit dicendo, Ego me baptizo in nomine, *etc.* Respondemus, quod cum inter baptizantem et baptizatum debeat esse discretio sicut ex verbis Domini colligitur, dicentis apostolis, *Ite, baptizate, etc.* memoratus Judæus est denuo ab alio baptizandus: ut ostendatur, quod alius est, qui baptizatur, et alius, qui baptizat. Ad quod etiam designandum ipse Christus non à seipso, sed à Joanne voluit baptizari. Quamvis si talis continuo decessisset, ad patriam protinus evolasset, propter sacramenti fidem, etsi non propter fidei sacramentum.” Decretal. *lib.* III. *tit.* xlii. *cap.* Debitum. See Porter, *Systema decret.* *p.* 444. Natalis Alexander, *Theolog. dogmat. tom.* I. *p.* 239.

The only argument that I remember brought against this decision and rejected, was derived from the fact that a priest might receive the Holy Communion from himself. See Scotus, *Reportat. Paris, lib.* IV. *dist.* vj. *qu.* 3. Aquinas, *Summa. pars.* III. *qu.* lxxvj. *art.* 5. “Aliud enim nutriri, aliud gigni; potest quis seipsum nutrire, non potest seipsum gignere.” Billuart, *cur-sus theol. tom.* viij. *p.* 424.



tus, sive non baptizatus; hæreticus, sive infidelis,— potest baptizare. Et valet baptismus a tali collatus; dummodo habeat intentionem baptizandi generalem vel specialem; et servet formam traditam ab ecclesia: quia non merita ministrorum, sed virtus Christi in baptismate operatur. Nec est talis ab alio catholico rebaptizandus.—Si autem in articulo necessitatis catholicus haberi possit qui baptizatus fuerit, congruentius est ab eo suscipere baptismum, quam a non baptizato. ¶ Item pater et mater absque præjudicio copulæ conjugalis, possunt in extremæ necessitatis articulo proprios filios in forma ecclesiæ baptizare. Si tamen alii adsint qui baptizare possint, non debet pater vel mater proprium filium baptizare. ¶ Item mulieri quamvis doctæ et sanctæ, sicut in conventu, docere non licet, ita nec aliquem nisi urgente necessitatis articulo baptizare. Ideo si vir et mulier simul adeunt, ubi immineret articulus necessitatis baptizandi puerum, et non esset alius minister ad hoc magis idoneus præsens, vir baptizaret et non mulier; nisi forte mulier bene sciret verba sacramentalia baptismi proferre, et non vir; vel aliud impedimentum subesset.—¶ Mutus non potest aliquem baptizare. Quod ideo est quia de essentia baptismi est certa forma verborum: quam mutus proferre non potest.”<sup>16</sup>

Before I even now proceed to the consideration of the present rule of the church of England regarding lay-baptism, there is a difficulty, which I am bound to

---

<sup>16</sup> *Pars. 2. cap. ij.*

notice, connected with much of this part of my subject, as it was also, with a former particular of it; and which has been discussed not only by canonists and schoolmen at great length and in detail, but by very learned writers in separate treatises.<sup>17</sup> I say, I cannot pass this difficulty by, either here or elsewhere, altogether without notice; and I shall remark upon it, adopting the words of Lyndwood and of Hostiensis. These extracts will explain sufficiently the opinion of the doctors of the church of England during the middle ages; since when, I am not aware of any canon in our church, or authoritative rule, bearing upon the matter.

The reader will not fail to perceive that the subject of these extracts, whatever may be his judgment on them, is nevertheless one which is not to be dismissed summarily, either as beneath the labour of argument, or altogether beside the question of baptism. I would

<sup>17</sup> I allude more particularly to a work, (more than once quoted above) not often met with, by Francisco Cangiamila; abounding in learning, and in curious research applied to the subject which he has undertaken. It is divided into four books, each of ten or twelve chapters: with the title, "Embryologia sacra, sive de officio sacerdotum, medicorum, et aliorum circa æternam parvulorum in utero existentium salutem." The heads of the four books are:

1. "De parochi aliorumque sacerdotum sollicitudine pro mulieribus prægnantibus: deque industriis ad abortus impediendos, et de baptismo abortivorum. 2. De auxilio infanti nonnato præstando matre defuncta. 3. De parochorum officio, ac vigilantia pro infantibus in partu difficili et desperato. 4. De Dei charitate erga nonnatos: deque auxiliis, quæ illis a parentibus, parochis, episcopis, et principibus præstanda sunt." Panormi. 1758. *Fol.*

that it were indeed the one, or the other: but that it is not so, is evident, as soon as we set about to decide *when*, i. e. as to what point of time, a living, breathing infant, becomes a proper subject of this sacrament. The moment we begin to draw the line, we are beset with difficulties and doubts.

Lyndwood introduces his remarks, in a gloss upon a constitution of archbishop Peccham, on the words *nati de maternis uteris*; and the reader will find his observations, printed already, above, *p.* 71.

To the same effect is the *Pupilla oculi*:<sup>18</sup> which it is not necessary to quote, as it merely repeats, with one or two additions of very questionable authority, the extract, in the note above, from the *Decretum*.

Hostiensis enters into some further details: “*Quid si mulier laborat in partu, adeo quod de morte ipsius et prolis timetur — sed non potest videri, utrum sit masculus vel femina; consulo obstetrici, quod accipiat aquam et—dicat sic, ‘Creatura Dei, ego te baptizo, etc.’ — Si proles nascitur, deportetur ad sacerdotem, et suppleat quod deest, secundum ea, quæ notantur supra. Et sive sit masculus, sive femina, creatura, vel bona res, vel cara res, vel bona dies, potest congrue appellari: sed nec vis est in nomine, cum etiam mutare possit, dum tamen in fraudem non fiat. Quid ergo si quis putet baptizare puerum, cui imponet nomen Petrus, cum forte sit puella, nunquid baptismus caret effectu? videtur quod sic: quia in*

---

<sup>18</sup> *París. II. cap. IV. K.*

sexu erratum est. Sed contra, quia non videtur, quod tales errores impedian baptismum: quantum enim ad Dei cultum, non est masculus, neque femina, neque liber, neque servus;—et licet homo erret in sexu, non errat in persona, quam tenet, et quam baptizare intendit.”<sup>19</sup>

We return to the general question of the validity of lay-baptism. It has been shewn that such baptism, when administered with the proper matter and the proper form, was, from the first ages, recognised and allowed by the Catholic Church. It has been proved that the decisions of the church of England are agreeable to, and continually enjoin, that ancient and universal practice, down to the sixteenth century; as is evident from her councils and the opinions of her canonists. And, further, I hold that we have no just reason to conclude that since that time, the middle of the sixteenth century, there has been any variation in her judgment as to the validity of lay-baptism.

I am well aware, that from time to time, divines of our Church have expressed doubts as to this fact, and some have denied the truth of it altogether. But these, even by their own admissions, not only form a small minority, but struggle against a constant stream of authorities who have upheld it.

It is very probable, that much of the opposition which has been made to the validity of lay-baptism, is to be attributed to the consequence which flows from

---

<sup>19</sup> Summa. lib. III. rubr. xlij.

it, namely, the allowing and recognizing baptisms administered in the numberless religious communities and sects, with which this country has, so long, been overwhelmed. Hence, it has been vehemently argued, that not only the proper matter and the proper form are essential parts of a valid baptism, but a lawful minister also. *Lawful*, as explained to be a priest or deacon, duly and canonically ordained by a bishop.

On the other hand, some take what may be called a modified view : they do not, because they cannot, refuse to acknowledge the constant and ancient rule of the Church in general, and of the English church in particular ; so, they consent still to the validity of lay-baptism, when it does occur, if it is administered within the pale of the Church. But they reject baptism by dissenters, accounting it “to be utterly invalid from the very first, it being done specifically *against* the authority of the Church.”<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup> I quote the words (in an unpublished communication) of a very learned friend ; who, I am bound to say, has accurately examined and considered the whole question ; it need scarcely be added, that he adopts the judgment of Waterland and Lawrence, and of the late editor of the last of these, Mr. Scott.

The argument is that dissenters' baptisms are of a new character, being so done *against* the Church, as was not to be found in those

ages when schismatical and heretical baptism was certainly recognized by the Church. I confess that I cannot see in what particulars such baptisms are against the Church, in distinction to the baptisms anciently conferred by the Novatians, and Arians, and others. It is not to be denied, that modern dissent, as a whole, is of a kind of which we have no example whatever in the Church of the fathers : but it does not follow that therefore their baptisms are



But, without the attempt to collect the different opinions advocated by different parties, and the many objections which lie against each in its turn,—a discussion which would involve other questions and difficulties, which do not fall within the proper scope of this dissertation,—I shall proceed to state what I believe to be the judgment, at the present time, of the church of England. Namely, this; that she still allows the validity of all baptisms, by whomsoever administered, provided only that they have been administered with the proper matter, and the proper form.<sup>21</sup> And, in saying, “she allows their validity,” I mean, that she does not permit any repetition of them. Not even the semblance of repetition; for if the essential parts of the sacrament, the matter and the form, can clearly be shewn to have been rightly observed, the church of England does not suffer the *hypothetical form* of baptism to be used.

Repeating once again,—(for it is a most important

to be totally rejected more than those administered by any particular class of ancient heretics.

Archdeacon Wilberforce has noticed the distinction which exists between *valid* and *sufficient* baptism: (*Ch. discipline*, p. 112.) referring to the charge of the bishop of Exeter in 1842, in which “that distinction is most ably pointed out.” The Charge is printed in Stephens’ collection of Statutes, &c. p. 2023. and the

reader should examine very carefully the arguments there adduced.

<sup>21</sup> I need scarcely say, that, of course, all baptisms administered by sects whether in this or any other country, who have not, and who repudiate, episcopal ordination, are not to be distinguished, as regards any quality so far, from other lay-baptism, in which no pretence of any sort of ministry or ordination is made.

fact, and one which has not been sufficiently considered in the attempts to settle this inquiry,) that the doctrine of the church of England upon the validity of lay-baptism up to the year 1549, had been insisted on over and over again, and was as well known to all her members both clerical and lay, as any other doctrine which she held, — repeating this, I say that if any alteration in her teaching has been, since that time, really made, we have a right to expect it to be as plain and precise as we find has been the case in similar things.

Thus, the teaching of the church of England, before the reformation, with respect to indulgences, and purgatory, and the denial of the Cup in the Holy Eucharist, and of the papal supremacy, and the like, was clear, definite, and open : not less so, her teaching on the same doctrines, since that period. If, therefore, she has indeed changed her belief as to the validity of lay-baptism, why can we not at once point plainly to some declaration of that change, equally open and undeniable ?

Not alone as regards this question immediately before us, but with reference to much, both of doctrine and of practice, of the very highest importance, I would earnestly, in this place, urge one word of warning and advice. Merely to serve a purpose, and to support a theory, let us be very careful in appealing to what we style the decisions of the church of England since the reformation, when those decisions are to be deduced, not from open and dogmatical assertions, but

from verbal alterations, and changes of rubrics, —from additions in one place, and omissions in another,—which no one offers as conclusive, being at the best available only to create a doubt. We do not know how soon we may be obliged to rely as our best and truest foundation, for even vital principles of our Faith, upon this; namely, that the Church of England *now* holds, teaches, and insists upon, all things whether of belief or practice, which she held, taught, and insisted on, before the sixteenth century, unless she has, since that time, plainly, openly, and dogmatically asserted the contrary. Such, at any rate, is the well known rule, in the parallel case of her canons of discipline and ecclesiastical law.

It is agreed that there was no alteration from the old observance, according to the long established rubrics of the Sarum and other manuals of the English church, made in the revised rituals of K. Edward vjth, or in the Book authorized during the reign of queen Elizabeth. Frequently as this has been allowed, it will be well to show it, somewhat in detail; if for no other reason, yet for this; that the reader may not have to refer to other volumes, even if he has them by him, which in every case is scarcely probable.

The Sarum rubric (and we need specify it only) was this. “¶ Notandum est quod quilibet sacerdos parochialis debet parochianis suis formam baptizandi in aqua pura—frequenter in diebus dominicis exponere, ut si necessitas emergat sciant parvulos in forma ecclesiæ baptizare, proferendo formam verborum bap-

tismi in lingua materna, distincte et aperte et solum unica voce—sic dicendo, ‘I cristene the .N. in the name of the Fadir, and of the Sone, and of the Holy Gost. Amen.’ Vel in lingua Latina, sic: ‘Ego baptizo te, *etc.*’ Aquam super parvulum spargendo, vel in aquam mergendo ter vel saltem semel. ¶ Et si puer fuerit baptizatus secundum illam formam, caveat sibi unusquisque ne iterum eundem baptizet: *etc.*”<sup>22</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Monumenta Ritualia, vol. 1. p. 28.

Here I cannot but protest against the unfairness with which bishop Jewell occasionally argued. Take an example. In his Defence of the Apology, he makes Harding say, “Baptism is but a light sacrament, and may be ministered by any lay person, an old woman,—so that she speak Latin, and understand not what she say. For otherwise, I trow, her doing may not stand for good.” *Works*, vol. 5. p. 5. Now, not to speak of the impossibility of such an argument in Harding’s mouth, Jewell (unlike many others of later times, after the old Service-books had become almost utterly destroyed,) must himself have known, from actual experience, the ancient rules of the English church, and the rubrics of her Manuals: by which, as the text shews above, an English form was expressly enjoined to be taught to the laity. I am utterly at a

loss to account for such a mode of arguing. Compare also his Answer to Harding, (*Works*, vol. 2. p. 92.) where he would have his reader conclude that the priests who use prayers in a learned tongue are “for the most part, such as are hardly able to make it learned.” The reason given is, because it happened that a priest ignorantly used the form, (noticed already above, p. 140) *In nomine Patria*, *etc.* Bishop Jewell was far too acute and too learned to be excused in adducing such arguments: the one known to be untrue, the other known to be a solitary instance. His works rest, generally, on a sounder foundation; but these and similar exceptions, when discovered, go far to weaken its solidity. The present is not an age, such perhaps as was the last century, when the English clergy take theological arguments on trust, and believe any statement on the mere reputation or name of the author. The editor

In the Books of K. Edward and queen Elizabeth, it is ordered; “Also [the pastors and curates] shall warn them, that without great cause and necessity, they baptize not children at home in their houses: and when great need shall compel them so to do, that then they minister on this fashion.—One of them shall name the child, and dip him in the water, or pour water upon him, saying these words; ‘*N. I baptize thee, etc.*’ And let them not doubt, but that the child so baptized is lawfully and sufficiently baptized, and ought not to be baptized again in the church.”

Thus stood the rubrics of the church of England down to the year 1604. But, before we proceed to the Prayer-Book put forth in that year, it will be desirable to add also an extract from the works of a writer of acknowledged authority during the reign of Elizabeth, which will shew that the ritual expressed the opinion of the soundest divines of that period.

I allude to archbishop Whitgift against the authors of the Admonition, and its defender, Cartwright. These had affirmed; “as for the baptizing by laye men,—for so much as the substance of the sacrament dependeth chiefly of the institution and worde of God, whiche is the forme, and as it were the life of the sacrament, of which institution this is one, and of the

---

of the Oxford edition of Jewell's works, lately published, would have as justly performed his duty, if he had not merely verified his author's extracts, but had also cor-

rected some of his misstatements. Surely, it could not have very much increased the size of the volumes?



chiefe partes, that it should be celebrated by a minister." To this the archbishop replied: "Undoubtedly if this your assertion were true, there had need be some generall rebaptization throughout all Christendome, as well of men as of children, for certeyne it is, that that sacrament hath beene ministred to many by such, as be in no degree of the ministerie.—So far as I can reade, the opinion of all learned men is, that the essentiall forme, and as it were the lyfe of baptisme is to baptize in the name of the Father, of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost, which forme being obserued, the sacrament remayneth in full force and strength of whome soeuer it be ministred." <sup>23</sup>

I am bound to confess that the archbishop somewhat evades the question of baptism by women:<sup>24</sup> and I cannot but think that Cartwright and his friends argued justly, that it was "to be collected out of the Book," i. e. the ritual. It may indeed be true, that however great the necessity, there might be time to send for the curate of the parish: but because there often might not be time, therefore the rubric gave permission to, nay ordered, some one of those who were present to baptize the child. And not only is there not the slightest

---

<sup>23</sup> Defense of the Answer, p. 519.

<sup>24</sup> In his first Answer, he had observed, (and if it had so remained there would have been no objection to be made,) "If women doe baptise, they baptise in priuate houses, not in the congregation."

p. 80. But immediately before he had said, "I denie baptizing by women to be expressed in that booke." p. 79. And in his Defense he repeats this: "If they dyd [baptize,] yet it followeth not that they doe it by the authoritie of the booke." p. 504.

hint shewn that women were disqualified, but there was the well known long established previous custom, according to which women, on such occasions, usually did baptize. For, as Cartwright further urged, it is to be remembered, “who they be that are present, when the child is so shortly after it is borne, in great daunger of death.”<sup>25</sup> Towards the end of the Defense, Whitgift returns to the subject again: and having stated, “for mine own experience this I dare affirme, that I haue not knowne one child so baptized in places where I haue had to do, no not since the beginning of the Q. Maiesties reigne;” (which is a fact not unlikely, and might or might not have been;<sup>26</sup>) he concludes by saying, (what we may fully consent to,) “I thinke if the circumstances of the booke be well considered, it will appeare that the meaning is, that priuate baptisme

---

<sup>25</sup> All this looks still more unlike the usual open and decided course of arguing which characterizes the archbishop, when we recollect that licenses were given in those days to midwives, and oaths exacted of them. Strype has printed one of these, from Parker’s register, in 1567, many years after the Book had been in force. The oath contains, amongst others, this clause. “Also, that in the ministration of the sacrament of baptism in the time of necessity, I will use apt and the accustomed words of the same sacrament, that is to say, these

words following, or the like in effect, “*I christen thee, in the name, etc.* and none other profane words.” *Annals. vol. 1. p. 537.*

<sup>26</sup> Archbishop Whitgift, from his close connection with the university, and from the various duties of his high station in it, could scarcely have had much experience as a parish-priest. It is possible that he never resided on the only rectory which I remember him to have had, Teversham, in Cambridgeshire. See Paule’s *Life of Whitgift. p. 4.* and Strype, *Life. p. 7.*

is rather to be ministred by some minister, than by any woman.”<sup>27</sup>

Many years after, in the year 1584, several demands were presented to the archbishop in a paper by the puritans, and among them the following. “That all baptyzing by mydwyllys and women—may from henceforth be inhibited and declared voyde: and that no bishop, or any of their officers, in the admitting of mydwyllys, do give them any such authoritie to baptize, as heretofore hath bin accustomed.” Whitgift answered; “—that the baptism mynistrd by women is lawfull and good, howsoever they mynister yt, lawfully or unlawfully (so that the institution of Christ, touching the *words* and *element*, be duly used) no learned man ever doubted, untill now of late, some one or two.—That they baptize ordinarilie and without necessitie, the Papists themselves doe not allow.”<sup>28</sup>

Here it is to be noticed, (and it is a very significant thing,) that the first opposers in the church of England of the validity of lay-baptism, were the disciples of John Calvin; who had adopted not only other errors of his, but this heresy especially, that baptism where it may be had is not of necessity to salvation. It will be acknowledged, even by those who may not consent generally to my opinion otherwise, that the true doctrine of the necessity of baptism (and of its being a

<sup>27</sup> *P.* 793.

astical Polity. *Book* 5. lxj.

I am sure that I need do no more than refer to the often-quoted passage of Hooker, in his *Ecclesi-*

<sup>28</sup> Strype. *Life* of Whitgift. *Records*. No. xvj.

sacrament which from its essential nature will not admit of iteration) probably led to the first recognition and allowance of lay-administration : and no less must it be acknowledged that fanciful and heretical notions of the conveyance of God's grace, and of His gift of eternal salvation to infants, in other ways than in those which He has Himself appointed, naturally produced first doubts, and then plain denials, of the validity of lay-baptism, and, in particular, of baptism by women.<sup>29</sup>

The fact being, therefore, evident, that till the beginning of the 17th century, no alteration was made in the rubrics of the English ritual, affecting in any way her ancient decisions as to lay-baptism, we come now to a very important period, the year 1603, in which the conference was held at Hampton Court, and the objections of the puritans were plainly laid

<sup>29</sup> See Calvin. *Instit. lib. 4. c. xv. §. 20. et seqq.* On the other hand must be compared the 16th section of the same chapter, cited by archbishop Whitgift : which, however, has regard not so much to lay-baptism, as to the validity of baptism received from clergy of the church of Rome ; against the arguments of the "Catabaptistes."

Vossius, speaking of the Catholic doctrine of the validity of lay-baptism, says : "Omnis ejusmodi oratio pro fundamento ha-

bet omnimodam baptismi necessitatem : *quam disput. vij. refellimus.* Negamus igitur, infantes eò periclitari de salute, quia non possint rite baptizari. Censemus etiam, potius quam ad baptismum ejusmodi recurramus, cujus nec mandatum, nec exemplum habeamus in Scripturis ; refugiendum esse ad sanctas preces : quibus pie creditur eam gratiam posse a Deo extra ordinem impetrari ; quam ordinarie conferre solet per baptismum." *De baptismo, disput. 10. §. viij.*

before the highest ecclesiastical and temporal authorities of the land. I shall be as brief as may be regarding this conference, as it has been discussed already in so many works upon this subject. It must not be forgotten, however, that whatever the result was, whether favourable or unfavourable to the continuance of lay-administration (continuance, that is, as respected direct and avowed permission) it was after all nothing more than a Conference; it was no expression of the synodical voice of either province, or even of one diocese, of the church of England.

So, also, we are bound to look upon the alterations which as a Book of Common Prayer, distinguished the Book of 1604, and those which for nearly sixty years succeeded it, both from the first Book of Edward the sixth, and from the present Book, in use since 1662. It rested upon no authority beyond the opinion, (great, I do not hesitate to admit) of certain bishops, and of the crown: falling far short of that, which we can alone recognize as *sufficient*; that is, the authority, in her provincial councils, of the whole English church. And, however weighty or however light the fact may be in controversy, it is a fact, which cannot be too often repeated and insisted on, that from the first Book of Edward VI. to the present Book of 1662, there was no Common Prayer Book, which we ought to or can admit to have been duly authorized by our Church. This, as to certain peculiarities of the Book of 1552, is of most material consequence.

If it were not that dean Barlow's account of the



conference has always been praised, and justly, for its correctness, I should hesitate to believe that archbishop Whitgift could have spoken as he is there reported. In introducing the subject of lay-baptism, he is said to have “shewed his Majesty, that the administration of baptism by women and lay-persons was not allowed in the practice of the church:—neither do the words of the Book infer any such meaning.” Surely he must have forgotten his own answer against the Admonition. Far more correctly did both the bishop of London (Bancroft) and the bishop of Winchester (Bilson) express the judgment of the English church; declaring, the one; “That those learned and reverend men, who framed the Book of Common Prayer, intended not by ambiguous terms to deceive any, but did indeed by those words intend a permission of private persons, to baptize in case of necessity.” And the other; “That the denying of private persons, in cases of necessity, to baptize, were to cross all antiquity;—and that it was also a rule agreed upon among divines, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament.”

The result of this was “a consultation whether into the rubric of private baptism, which leaves it indifferently to all, laics or clergy, the words *curate or lawful minister* might not be inserted, which was not so much stuck at by the bishops.” Dr. Montague, in a letter written at the time, January 1603, gives somewhat a different account; that “the king in the end won this of them [the bishops], that baptism should only be

administered by ministers, yet in private houses if occasion required, and that whosoever else should baptize should be under punishment.”<sup>30</sup>

This additional statement of Dr. Montague must not be passed over without one word. It must be remembered that he was dean of the chapel royal, and displayed adulation of the king, and especially of the royal conduct in this conference, exceeding, if it were possible, even that of the bishops who were concerned in it. Hence, he would naturally represent the success of the king's wishes to have been nearly complete. If his account be true we learn from it the earnestness with which the bishops withstood the royal demands; —“in the end he won this of them;”—but on the other hand, (still, if it be true) it is very strange that we have no record of the amount of punishment which was decided on against offenders, or of any instance in which that punishment was enforced. I am inclined to believe that the bishops did *not* agree that those, who being lay “should baptize, should be under punishment.”

However, a very important addition was made in the office of private baptism: the words “lawful minister” were inserted into the rubric in more places than one. And I am quite ready to allow the consequence which

---

<sup>30</sup> Hist. of Conferences. p. 138.

By the way; a very scandalous enactment, passed in 3 James I. cap. 5. §. XIV. obliged all “popish recusants,” under a penalty of

100*l.* to bring their children, within one month after birth, to the parish church, there to be baptized by a “lawful minister.” Gibson, *Codex*. p. 367.

may fairly be deduced from these insertions ; amounting to this, and to no more than this : namely : that as great a discouragement to the practice of lay-baptism was given, upon the authority of the bishops and of the crown, as was consistent with the acknowledgment nevertheless of the validity of baptism, so administered, whether in cases of necessity or not. In thus plainly discouraging the practice, nothing was done beyond what had been repeated over and over again, for centuries, by the church of England ; that only as a last resource lay-baptism was to be resorted to.

A writer,<sup>31</sup> who, with considerable ability but with little moderation, some years since attacked Sir John Nicholl's judgment on the validity of lay-baptism, has an argument which rests upon the alteration made also, in 1604, in the title of the Office. He says ; “ a reference to the Service Books will show that in the former the title was perfectly general ; for any thing there expressed to the contrary, the Office might be used by *any one*. In James' Book, this generality disappears, and the use of the office is *limited*, by the title, to “ the *minister* of the parish, or any other *lawful minister* that can be procured.” At the utmost, the limitation expressed in the title is that only of the rubric ; and it was not an unlikely addition to have been made, immediately after the conference. I am glad however to allow that it is very significant : be-

---

<sup>31</sup> Dissenters' Baptisms and Church Burials. By the Rev. Walter Blunt.

cause, if so, much more significant is the erasure of it, and the return to the ancient *general* title, which were agreed upon and authorized by both convocation and parliament in 1662.

I have said that the insertion of the term “lawful minister”—supposing (which I deny) that *lawful* must mean *ordained*—amounts to no more than a very plain discouragement of lay-administration; no one can venture to assert that it positively declares the invalidity of baptisms so administered, from that time to the present. It might reasonably have had, nay it has had, the effect of checking, within the pale of the Church since 1662, almost entirely, such a practice; but, when lay-baptism is conferred, whether within the Church or without her, whether by her own people not clergy, or by schismatic and heretical teachers pretending to ordination, the church of England now holds as she has ever held, that the minister is not of the essence of the sacrament of baptism.

There is a fact of the most material importance, as regards the alterations made after the Hampton Court conference, which seems to me to be conclusive, and yet has not been insisted on.

It is certain that there was an outcry by the puritans at that time against, not the mere recognition, but the avowed permission, by the Church, of lay-baptism: it is little less certain that king James had adopted to a great extent the same views, and, if he could, would

“have won” (as Montague says) of the bishops, a judgment and distinct enunciation of its utter invalidity.<sup>32</sup> He gained much of them, and rightly gained it. It was fitting, if lay-baptism had been, as seems probable, carelessly resorted to when there was no urgent necessity, that it should be, as far as possible, put a stop to. So, the words “lawful minister” were inserted. And if, with this insertion, there had been no other change, I must confess that there would have been some appearance of force in the argument which is drawn from it. But the interrogatories which were ordered to be made of those who brought the child were also altered: and it is really not to be conceived, that this was done without a purpose, directly aiming at the very doctrine which had been disputed.

There was no doubt that by the old Books lay-baptism was permitted: now, in 1604, the words “lawful minister” would seem to deny, or perhaps rather to disallow, its validity in future. Yet the bishops who spoke so plainly at the conference would not consent to this, nor, they knew well, had it ever been the doctrine of the Church. How then was the difficulty to be met? if the questions stood as before, they would assist the propagation of the new error. So the questions were changed. The two first remained as they

---

<sup>32</sup> After the bishops had spoken, baptizaton, although either women or laics had baptized.” but not till then, the king said that he “utterly disliked all re-



had been. “By whom was this child baptized? Who was present when the child was baptized?” Both very fit and proper, but neither of them affecting the validity of the sacrament: for if one, why not the other? which is absurd. And then, for the first time, comes in this statement, preceding the enquiry into the matter and the form: evidently relating to the use of the new term, “lawful minister,” and as evidently declaring that whatever might else be meant by it, this it could not mean, that a “lawful minister” is of the essence of the sacrament of baptism. “And because some things, Essential to this Sacrament, may happen to be omitted through fear or haste in such times of extremity; therefore I demand further of you, With what matter was the child baptized? With what words was the child baptized?”

If it should be supposed that the last question in the Book of 1604 “Whether think you the child to be lawfully and perfectly baptized?” has any, even the remotest bearing upon the argument before us, I can only observe, that if I thought it worth while, it might be made available to support the view which I have been insisting upon to be the correct one to be taken of the alterations at that time made. I would merely remind the reader that it was in the earlier books of Elizabeth and Edward, and was struck out at the last review in 1662. The convocation then justly deciding, that the minister of the parish, and not the people who happen to bring the child, is the proper judge

whether all things "essential to this sacrament" have been done as they ought to be.<sup>33</sup>

I must not leave the consideration of the questions or interrogatories, without transcribing the very important rubric, which, in its main feature, namely, the declaration of the constituents of a valid baptism, makes its first appearance also in the Book of 1604, by way of further prevention of the error likely enough to be attached to the use of the new term "lawful minister." "If they which bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the priest's questions, as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water, In the Name of the Father, *etc.* (which are essential parts of baptism) then let the priest baptize it, *etc.*" Here there is not a word said about the minister: and, as if to make assurance double sure, "the essential parts of baptism" are expressly stated. Such minuteness before the conference and the consequent alterations, would have been uncalled for, even if not out of place; afterwards, it was neither the one nor the other.<sup>34</sup>

<sup>33</sup> See above, p. 171.

<sup>34</sup> It has been argued that only in case the parish priest finds by the answer to the first question, that a lawful (i. e. an ordained) minister has baptized the child, is he to proceed further "to examine as to the *manner* in which that *lawful* minister performed the rite." *Blunt*, p. 103. But

this appears somewhat strange. It would rather be thought, that if an ordained person had been the minister, he could hardly have used, either through inadvertence, or fear, or haste, any other than the proper matter, and the proper form. He would have both knowledge and experience, and would be free also from the anxiety and

Before I conclude this part of my subject, I would observe, briefly, upon one or two objections.

Much stress has been laid, by the opponents of the recognition of the validity of lay-baptism by our Church since 1604, upon the words "lawful minister," as interpreted by the 23rd article, and the ordinal. It has been forgotten by both parties, that "lawful minister" in its obvious meaning, with regard to the sacrament of baptism, includes, under certain circumstances, not only persons clerical, but lay. This had always been the doctrine of the church of England until K. James' reign; why are we to conclude that it was suddenly repudiated then? I omit all notice of the discussion at Hampton Court, and of the complaints of the puritans;—I take the Book of 1604, and compare it with its predecessors, of Elizabeth and Edward; I examine the records and the rituals, the canons and decisions of the Church from the days of K. Edward to the coming of the first archbishop of Canterbury;—and throughout the whole line and series, there is one uniform and consistent testimony, that what we are to

---

hurry likely enough to disturb and harass persons connected, probably by near ties, with the dying. I fully agree, therefore, with one of the counsel in the case of *Mastin v. Escott*, that "it clearly appears to apply to laymen." *Report. p. 39.* and Sir H. Jenner, in his judgment on that case, goes even further, (to an ex-

tent which I hesitate to follow) saying, that by the earlier rituals of Edward and Elizabeth, "private baptism was not expected to be administered by a person in holy orders, who could hardly be supposed to be in such trouble of mind as to be unable to state what passed at the time." *Ibid. p. 282.*

understand by the "lawful minister" of baptism, must as to his "lawfulness" depend upon the necessity of the case in which he is called upon to act. Hence, therefore, the 23rd article and the preface to the ordinal have no legitimate bearing upon the proper interpretation to be put upon those two words, still standing in our ritual. Referred to the sacrament of baptism, the church of Rome would assent to the truth of the statements in both those formularies. She, with ourselves, would declare, that it is "unlawful for any man to administer the sacraments, before he be lawfully called and sent;" and "that no man must execute either of the functions of bishop, priest, or deacon, unless he hath had episcopal consecration, or ordination." Nevertheless that Church fully recognizes the validity of baptism administered by lay persons; and acknowledges, that, in certain circumstances, they are its "lawful ministers."

The canons of 1575 have been much relied upon: or rather, one of them, the 12th: which, it seems agreed, was not published with the printed copies of the canons then passed in convocation. The question is, why was it omitted? probably, because happily it did not receive the royal assent. The object of the canon was to prevent lay-baptism, on the authority of the bishops, acting conjointly, as being authorized "to expound and resolve all doubts" which might arise of the true meaning of any parts of the Prayer Book.

Now, in the first place, I contend that the power which the bishops thus claimed, exceeded that which

is given them in the Preface to the Prayer Book : according to that Preface, which is also statute-law, the bishop of each diocese may resolve doubts, which parties shall propose to him ; but the bishops of the province have no authority to meet together, and put their own interpretation upon any rubrics whatsoever. This would be to enact new rubrics, not to expound old ones. And each case of doubt is to be met and resolved from time to time, by individual bishops, as it occurs. Nor am I clear, that if one parish-priest in a diocese has any doubt as to the true meaning of a rubric, and applies to the bishop for his judgment, that another, who has no doubt, would be bound to obey that judgment. It seems required, that before the bishop's judgment can be binding, there should be a doubt existing either in the mind or as to the practice of the inferior minister.

But, in the second place, (to return to the canon of 1575,) it pretended " to expound and to resolve " where no doubt or ambiguity could possibly exist. It might have been politic at the time to fancy it, and to try to act upon that fancy. But common sense refuses to perceive the slightest ambiguity in the rubrics of the Books of Elizabeth and Edward, in this matter of lay-baptism. If any rule was ever distinct and plain, these were so. And the puritans argued most justly in insisting upon it.

Therefore, this last consideration alone being decisive, we cannot be astonished that the royal assent was not given to the 12th canon, and that it became a



dead letter. Had it been anything more, it must have been noticed both by Hooker and at the conference. It could not have been unknown, or forgotten, but was felt to be of no real weight, and unworthy of being appealed to.<sup>35</sup>

Once more: the lxxixth canon, of 1604, has been brought forward to prove, (that is, if in this controversy it can prove any thing,) if any minister being duly informed of the danger of death of an infant unbaptized, shall refuse to baptize the same, that *therefore* the infant, in the judgment of the Church at that time and now, must die unbaptized. But the canon says nothing of the sort; and might very well have been passed in any period of the history of our Church, (say, the 15th century) when lay-baptism in cases of necessity was ordered, and the form, which was to be used, carefully taught. It says, and most properly, that if through the default of the minister, the child should die unbaptized, "the said minister shall be sus-

---

<sup>35</sup> The canon, moreover, is itself inexplicable; I am utterly at a loss to know what is to be understood by a *lawful minister or deacon*. "Private baptism" it declares "is only to be administered by a lawful minister or deacon called to be present for that purpose, and none other." And, if the term "all other persons" really is to be understood to mean "lay-persons," it certainly was not requisite for the bishops of the

English church, so soon after the reformation, to tell them that "the ministering of baptism privately, is no part of their vocation." To call this canon a resolution of the ambiguities of the old rubrics of the Office of private baptism, is simply ludicrous.

See the canon in Collier, *vol. 2. p. 552*. Cardwell, *Synodalia. vol. 1. p. 135*. Wilkins, *concil. vol. 4. p. 285*.

pended for three months." There can be no doubt, I repeat it, that early in the 17th century earnest measures were taken to check the unreasonable and irregular extent, to which lay-baptism, as a practice rather than an exception, had reached. Probably the energy of some of the bishops, coupled with the alterations consequent on the Hampton Court conference, might be likely to produce a re-action; and people, it may have been supposed, would wait occasionally too long for the attendance of the parish-priest or his deacon. Hence, if there were no other cause, there were just grounds why a canon, having especial reference to the *immediate* duties of the ministers of a parish, when so called for, should be passed at that convocation, urgently desiring them under a penalty, no longer to depend upon the almost certain and often unnecessary interference of lay-persons baptizing as of old, but themselves to hasten to the spot, lest, *through their default*, any should die unbaptized.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>36</sup> It is strange that in our times, some of the clergy, who advocate extreme doctrines respecting the Grace in baptism, go beyond the early puritans, and will have it that baptism cannot be valid except by an ordained minister, and with previous prayer to God. This they insist upon, however urgent the necessity, and danger of death. I can only say, that any "Minister," who, through such his default of perverse and

foolish delay to offer up a prayer, should suffer a child to die unbaptized, would amply deserve suspension according to the canon.

But these persons have an argument; and we are referred to the rubric. "First, let the minister of the parish—call upon God, and say the Lord's Prayer, and so many of the collects appointed to be said before in the Form of Public Baptism, as the time and present exigence will suffer." Cer-

The above argument in answer to the objections founded upon the lxixth canon, is one which would

---

tainly, if this were all that we know of the matter, and if the clergy were justified in undertaking and continuing to perform the solemn duties of their office, with no more learning than is to be gleaned from the present Book alone of 1662, the rubric might seem to be ambiguous, and their argument not unreasonable.

The Church however takes for granted—(I would that she were not so frequently deceived)—takes for granted that her clergy are at some pains to ascertain by study and comparison the real meaning of her rubrics. Now, this one before us is to be traced to the First Book of 1549, in similar but plainer words; “First, let them that be present call upon God for his grace, and say the Lord’s prayer, if the time will suffer.”

Still, we may be told, the alteration made in 1662, was made for a purpose. If, then, there was any purpose, it must have been to insist upon prayer, as an essential to a valid administration of baptism. Why therefore, let us ask, was not some mention of it included in the examination ordered to be made of those who bring the child? There is no reference to it; nor is this all.

Anciently there was a question. “Whether they called upon God for grace and succour in that necessity?” And this question was actually omitted by the Book of 1662, as if providentially to prevent any reliance being placed upon it, to support so grievous an error.

It is indeed most fitting that the Lord’s Prayer and one or two of the collects at the beginning of the office of public baptism, especially, if a priest officiate, that of the benediction of the water, should always be used, according to the rubric, if the exigence will suffer. But the anxiety of the reviewers in 1662 to promote this end, caused the ambiguity of which I have spoken: they wished to insert the words “*so many*” and therefore necessarily changed the old clause, “*if the time,*” into, “*as the time.*” They could not possibly foresee the egregious folly and ignorance combined, which some of their descendants would exhibit, in consequence of this alteration. Nor should I have thought it worth while to have delayed so long, even in a note, about it, had I not heard, and often heard, the fact gravely insisted on, that *therefore* prayer is an essential of valid baptism.

doubtless have occurred to almost every one: but it is not the only one, neither the most powerful. There is another which positively destroys the force of the objection altogether. It is said that the canon—(supported, as it certainly is, by very frequent inquiries of bishops and archdeacons at their visitations to a like effect)—proves, that the child must necessarily, in the judgment of the church of England, die unbaptized, if, the minister neglecting to come, it dies at all.<sup>37</sup> This argument would prove too much: for the canon, on which such a cloud of difficulty is raised, is but a mere repetition of many, exactly to the same effect, if not in almost the same words, in times when lay-baptism in cases of emergency was the rule and practice of our Church. Therefore, as such canons and inquiries cannot mean what it is pretended they mean in the one instance, so neither can they in the other: and the canon of 1604 *must* necessarily be interpreted as I have already suggested that it *might* be. As to the earlier orders to this effect, take, for example, the canons of Ælfric in the 10th century: “Si non baptizatus infans subito apportaretur ad sacerdotem, baptizet eum statim in festinatione, ne moriatur paganus.” And, shortly after, the ecclesiastical laws under Æthelred: “Si quis aliquem ægrotum infantem ad presbyterum apportet, tunc statim eum baptizet, et ob nullum impedimentum illum baptizare negligat,—si absque baptismate moriatur, tunc sciat, quod in die iudicii pro

---

<sup>37</sup> Blunt, *Dissenters' baptisms, etc.* p. 115.

anima illa rationem redditurus sit Deo." And, once more, for it is needless to extract others, a canon of the council at York, in 1195; "Sub eodem tenore constitutionis adjicimus, ut quoties sacerdos ad puerum baptizandum invitatur, moras innectere non præsumat."<sup>38</sup>

We have further to remember, in deciding upon the true interpretation which we ought to put upon the changes in the ritual made in 1604, (and in 1662 which adopted most of them,) that at that very time, a large addition, having direct reference to the two sacraments of baptism and the supper of the Lord, was made to the catechism. If, therefore, the intention of the Church was to teach that henceforward the minister was to be of the essence of the sacrament of baptism, it is scarcely conceivable but that some plain notice should be taken of that new particular. On the contrary, there is not even an allusion to it. The question and answer which seem to speak of the essential parts of baptism are not clearly worded, and the form is brought in rather by the way, than as being necessary to complete the answer to the question, which might very well have ended, as it begins, with this one word "Water." However, it is a remarkable fact, that in this addition, to which so easily might have been further added "by a lawful minister," and what is to be understood by "lawful,"—there is not any mention of the minister at all. This omission, under

---

<sup>38</sup> Wilkins. *Concilia. tom. 1. p. 253. 269. 502.*



all the circumstances, is as significant, as the difficulty is great to account for it, if the rulers of the church of England, either in 1604 or in 1662, did indeed intend that lay-baptism should no longer be accounted valid.

Another argument of no little weight is to be drawn from the Office for baptizing such as are of riper years, which was prepared for and appended to the Book of 1662. The reason for this is expressly stated in the Preface, that it was to meet the cases of those who had never been baptized; as the last rubric has it, of "persons not baptized in their infancy." The reviewers could not but know how many thousand children had been baptized by all sorts of persons, pretending to all sorts of ordinations, during the last few years. But these did not fall within their consideration, being already "baptized." And their wise care was especially directed against the Anabaptists, whose peculiar heresy it was to deny baptism to infants. "It was thought convenient," says the Preface, "that there should be added—an office for the baptism of such as are of riper years; which, although not so necessary when the former Book was compiled, yet by the growth of Anabaptism, through the licentiousness of the late times crept in amongst us, is now become necessary." Here again, on any principles except those for which I have been contending, it is impossible to account for the total silence observed as to lay-baptism, and the "lawful minister."

The bishop of Tasmania in his lectures on the catechism has some remarks, which I would make

here an observation upon ; because, independently of the general value of the work itself in which they occur, they afford a characteristic example of the treatment of the question before us in late years. “ If we are to discard,” the bishop says, “ all logical subtleties and legal arguments, and to take up the common sense view of the matter, it would seem, that, (inasmuch as the administration of the sacraments ordained of Christ must be a more important duty, and a far higher privilege than the administration of any rite ordained of men,) if a layman can rightly baptize,—much more can he rightly confirm the baptized, consecrate churches, license ministers, or exercise any other episcopal function.<sup>39</sup> Much has been said and written, in these days, respecting the validity of lay and heretical baptism ; and, it is argued, that, because the church of England in times past had sanctioned the practice in some cases, she, therefore, recognizes the lawfulness and efficacy of the act in all. This would be too hasty a conclusion. It must be remembered that no baptisms were performed by laymen, except by such as were specially authorized, and licensed for the purpose, by the bishop of the diocese.<sup>40</sup> And further such baptisms were performed only in extreme cases.”<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup> The bishop (I presume) can scarcely be understood to mean that “ confirmation,” and “ licensing ministers” are to be looked upon equally as mere “ episcopal functions.”

<sup>40</sup> This most extraordinary statement is given on the authority of Hook’s Ch. Dict. art. Lay Baptism. The proof of it would be curious.

<sup>41</sup> *P.* 595.

But, whether or no we are to discard in this enquiry logical subtleties and legal arguments, we must be very careful *not* to take “a common-sense view” of it. It is to a too great partiality for that mode of dealing with theological difficulties, that we have to trace very many of the errors widely prevalent among us, and much of the irreverence with which deep mysteries of the Faith are commonly regarded. Let it be conceded that common-sense would reasonably draw the conclusion which the bishop has suggested: this may or may not be: but the doctrine of the Christian sacraments is not to be settled by an appeal to a tribunal so wavering and various in its judgments, so warped by the chances of education, so stubborn in its prejudices. Secondarily and doubtfully we may indeed make use of its assistance: which in such questions is legitimate, not in deciding, but in deliberating; not in concluding, but in enquiring; not in declaring what is reasonable, but in examining and testing the weight and authority of evidence. The sacraments are not to be brought down to and judged by the low level of human reason. Facts, which are apparently contrary to and certainly inexplicable by common-sense, may nevertheless be facts, truths hidden among the deep things of God. We all acknowledge that Catholic doctrines are not to be rejected solely because they may seem to be either the one or the other. Else, (not to mention other mysteries,) we may at once discard the truth that the consecrated elements in the Holy Eucharist are the Body and the Blood of

our Lord : or, that by the washing of water with the word sinful man is cleansed by the Holy Spirit, regenerated, and sanctified.

I shall now conclude this enquiry into the question, Who is the proper minister of the sacrament of baptism? and with respect to the judgment of the church of England, at present, regarding lay-administration, I trust that it has been sufficiently shewn, that now as of old she recognizes and admits all baptisms to be valid, by whomsoever conferred, if done with the proper matter and the proper form : also, that there is no evidence by which we may justly suppose, that the ancient permission which the Church always gave to lay-persons to baptize, in cases of necessity, has, during the last 200 years, been withdrawn.

It will probably be objected that I have entered unnecessarily at so great a length into the latter part of this subject, namely, the present law of the church of England. But, remembering the dissatisfaction which was caused to very many of our clergy by the judgment given by Sir John Nicholl, in 1809, and again, by Sir Herbert Jenner, in 1841,<sup>42</sup> both recognizing the validity of lay-baptism, I have been desirous to express my opinion, and entire agreement with those decisions : and also, the steps by which I have arrived at it. I am not ignorant that I differ from many very learned members of our Church ; nor do I hesitate to confess, that some years since I thought myself on

---

<sup>42</sup> *Kemp v. Wickes.* 1809. *Mastin v. Escott.* 1841.

this question otherwise than I now believe to be the truth respecting it. But a repeated examination, and consideration of the arguments on both sides, and a careful search into authorities which I am bound to acknowledge, have compelled me to come to the conclusions which I have stated. Let me say again that they have not been hastily arrived at.

Whilst, upon the one hand, the arguments of the counsel in the late case of *Mastin v. Escott*, against the validity of lay-baptism, now, in our Church, appeared to me (from the first) to be weak and inconclusive, I would not, upon the other, be understood to consent to very many of the arguments and opinions urged by the counsel for the plaintiff.<sup>43</sup> The judgment

<sup>43</sup> Such (for example) as, that "schismatical and heretical baptism must be valid, because otherwise the church of England would be unchristianized; for it cannot be denied that her baptism, her orders, everything she has, was derived through the church of Rome." *Report*, p. 169. Which is a repetition of the old absurdity put forth by Bingham. Or, again, that the Scotch kirk is a part of the Catholic Church, *because*, says the Queen's Advocate, "she has been recognized as a branch of it by acts of our parliament:" a position which the learned Judge himself assented to, adding, "it is acknowledged in an act of the last session of parliament." *Ibid.* p.

175. This, by the way, is as much as to say, (which happily is the truth) that the Scotch kirk has never been so acknowledged by any act of the Church.

Very much in both these cases was urged, upon the point of the excessive harshness and indecency which would ensue from the refusal to bury such persons, as unbaptized, (although wrongly so regarded) within our churchyards, and with our solemn service. These arguments mainly sprung from a very wide assertion by Sir John Nicholl; that, "the Church knows no such indecency as the putting into the earth of a body, without the performance of the service." But if it is true that the common



itself of Sir H. Jenner evidences the care bestowed upon it, and is much to be commended for the moderation of its tone.

I am in hopes, also, that this whole discussion will not be without much useful result. Since the Appeal from Sir H. Jenner's judgment was decided, I am not aware that any enquiry or controversy about the subject of it has taken place. The clergy generally have silently (perhaps some sullenly?) acquiesced: but it

law gives a right to a grave, it is no less true that the Church, in certain cases, does not permit the service to be used. "*Here is to be noted,*" says the rubric, "*that the office ensuing is not to be used for any that die unbaptized, or excommunicate, or have laid violent hands upon themselves.*" Even though, in these cases which came before the court, the parties were clearly not to be classed under one of these heads, did it follow that *therefore* they were justly entitled to be buried with the rites of our holy Church? Possibly under the shelter of the technicalities of the law, they were so: but far different would have been the judgment of sterner and purer times.

One word more upon this, a very sad and painful subject. I cannot conceive how it is, that persons can claim, either for themselves or for their relatives, the performance of the Service ap-

pointed by the Church, over their dead bodies, when, their whole lives, they have despised, and rejected, and opposed the Church in every possible way. If there is any one part of our Ritual which, more than another, offends schismatics of this kind, Wesleyans, Presbyterians, and the rest, it is our Office for the burial of the Dead. I have above spoken of the kirk of Scotland: at its first beginning, this was *their* order of burial, and was largely adopted in after-years by dissenting sects in this country. I do not know whether it is still in use, but, if it is, the listening to such an Office as our own, intended for Christian dead, must be indeed a trial. However, here it is;—(was it in Sir J. Nicholl's mind when he said, the Church knows no such indecency, *etc.*?)—"The corpse is reverently brought to the grave, accompanied with the congregation, *without any further*

would be absurd to say that they have been convinced. Nor am I idle enough to presume that the mere statement of my own opinion will have much weight. The matter, however, will be reopened under, it may be, a different aspect and in different times.

Let it not be forgotten that in the question of the validity of lay-baptism two points are involved. One, the judgment and decision always of the Church Catholic; the other, the judgment and decision now of our own church, the church of England. Whether a particular Church may alter at her own will and pleasure the essentials of the sacraments of the gospel,—and, be it well considered that to reject lay-baptism is to say, and no less than to say, that the minister *is* of the essence of the sacrament of baptism,—making them at one time to consist in what at another time they do not consist, I shall not enquire: because I am indeed most thankful from my heart to believe, that in the doctrine of lay-baptism, as in all others of the like importance, there is not nor has there ever been any variation between the church of England and the

---

*ceremonies*: which being buried, the minister if he be present, and required, goeth to the church, if he be not far off, and maketh some comfortable exhortation to the people touching death and resurrection.” Not only no ceremonies, no service, but even only as it might happen, the presence of “the minister.”

I am not arguing now upon the fact whether they who think such an order of burial to be the proper one, and such as they, are right or wrong in their opinions. But this I do repeat: it is, almost beyond belief, strange, that when they die they desire to be buried in our churchyards, and *with our Service*.

Church Catholic. The judgment of both has constantly been the same ; that Baptism, by whomsoever administered, if with the proper Matter and the proper Form, is to be received and acknowledged.<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup> “ It was always the doctrine of the reformation,” says archbishop Laurence, “ that the element of water alone, united to the form of words prescribed by our Saviour, constituted true baptism. In conformity, therefore, with this doctrine, our own church, in the case under contemplation [private baptism] enjoined nothing more

than water and the word as absolutely necessary to baptismal efficacy ; adding, ‘ And let them not doubt but that the child *so* baptized is *lawfully and sufficiently* baptized, and ought not to be baptized again.’ ” Doctrine of the Ch. of Engl. on the efficacy of baptism. *part 2. p. 117.*

CHAPTER X.



WE, naturally, from the last division of this dissertation, pass on to the consideration of the Necessity of baptism. It was to this truth that the Church further appealed, in permitting, when danger of death was urgent, the sacrament of baptism to be administered by laypersons.

Theologians have been accustomed to speak of baptism as being necessary, either "*necessitate medii*," or "*necessitate præcepti*."<sup>1</sup> Regarding the first of these, we rely upon the Scripture; "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." Regarding the second, also upon the Scripture; "Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Hence, therefore, the church of England carefully

---

<sup>1</sup> So Dr. Featley; (speaking of the two texts, S. John, iij. 5. S. Mark, xvj. 16:) "Baptisme is the ordinary means of salvation; and that baptisme is so far necessary, as well *ratione præcepti* as *ratione medii*, no orthodox understanding protestant ever denied,

neither is there any reall controverse betweene the protestants and papists in this point; but only verball, as doctor Reynolds excellently clearly well proveth in his lectures, *de censura Apocryphorum*." The Dippers Dipt. edit. 1646. p. 7.

admonishes her people thus. “Whereby”—(referring, that is, to the text just quoted, “Except a man, *etc.*”)—“ye may perceive the great necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had.” And immediately afterwards we are reminded of the other text, “Go ye into all the world, *etc.*” This necessity, with respect to the recipients of the sacrament, is binding upon all adults for both reasons: not merely as it is the only known means whereby we may be saved, and made members of the Christian Church; but because of the command also. We baptize infants, by whom the command that it should be received cannot be understood, on account of the first reason only.

Our Church, in this her admonition, has well relied upon the texts to which she appeals. “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.” It is impossible to draw any distinction here, between the two things required of us; faith, and baptism. There is the same necessity of the one as of the other; nor of the one only, and not the other also. And faith at least, at all times, and in some manner, has been allowed by all sects to be necessary to salvation: therefore baptism is no less so.

Again; the Same, our Blessed Lord, has said, “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” In which words there is no difference made, or allowed,—between Jew or Gentile, bond or free, young or old, sex, quality, or condition, whether in the time of our Saviour only, or in all future years,—but one expressed,



broad, rule laid down, including all mankind from that age for ever, under its plain provisions.

It is true, and many have objected this against the necessity of baptism, that immediately succeeding the promise of our Blessed Lord, “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,” this clause also is added; “And these signs shall follow them that believe; In My name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover.” The argument drawn from this is, that as we certainly no longer see these signs and wonders accompanying or following the administration of baptism, that sacrament cannot now be of absolute necessity. But, not to insist upon the common and erroneous notion that the gift of such miraculous powers was limited to the apostolic or at least to the first ages of the Church,—an error, because we have complete evidence of miracles worked in much later days, and we neither know when such gifts were to be withdrawn, nor whether they do not rather rest now upon the Church and within her,—not to insist, I say, upon this, it is evident, that the same argument if correct would prove, not so much the indifference of baptism as the failure of faith; and that it is no longer required of any man that he should believe, in order that he may obtain salvation. A conclusion which even the Socinians would deny.

Apparently, there is a more reasonable objection to be derived from the parallel words (parallel, that is, in

one respect) of our Blessed Lord, when He said ; “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.” It is undeniable that these words refer to the eucharist : yet the Church never acknowledged or taught that actual participation of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is so necessary, as that without it (in the case of infants, for example,) there can be no salvation. Therefore, the objection runs, baptism is not more necessary than the sacrament of the eucharist. But the fact that the Church from the beginning has held the absolute necessity of the one, as distinguished from the absolute necessity of the other, is in itself a sufficient answer against such a conclusion. Moreover, mark the difference in the expressions used by our Saviour ; in the one case, “ Except a man<sup>2</sup> be born again, *etc.*” *Εαν μη τις γεννηθῇ.* Here there is no limitation, nothing to denote some in particular and not others ; but the words are indefinite and general, spoken as of every one alike, and in the third person. On the contrary in the other, people then surrounding our Blessed Lord were addressed : of course, in them also all future members of the Church, who should be, as they were, grown up and

---

<sup>2</sup> A somewhat remarkable instance of the unwisdom of relying in argument only on the English version of the scriptures, is mentioned by Wall. “ Some of the antipædobaptists that can read no other than the English translation, will sometimes very un-

warily urge it against the pædobaptists ; and will observe that it is said, *Except a man be born*, *etc.* it is not said, a *child*, concluding from the word that he that is so born must be a man grown.” *Infant Baptism. vol. 2. p. 188.*

capable of being taught the precepts of the Gospel. And so the command is “Except *ye* eat, *etc.*” Nor are the last words of the text without a most significant meaning: “— *ye* have no life in you:” which must not be interpreted of the commencement, but the continuance of spiritual life; and in a sense very different from the “entrance into the kingdom of heaven.” By that entrance the life is given, which, in after years, requires repeated support and nourishment, without which we “have no life” in us.

The question how far baptism, where it cannot be obtained, may be supplied by an earnest desire of the sacrament, accompanied with sincere repentance and faith, a state which can be possible to adults only;—or, in infants, who die unbaptized, by their presumed desire, and innocence of actual sin committed by themselves;—these are questions which I shall not enter upon; inasmuch as we have no sure warrant of Scripture to decide them, or sufficient authority in the earliest ages to guide us towards a conclusion, which may not seem to be wise above what is written. I am well contented to press no further than the just determinations of our Church; that this, at least, “is certain by God’s word; that children which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved.”<sup>3</sup> And this also: that baptism is necessary, “where it may be had.”

---

<sup>3</sup> “De parvulis hoc certissimum est, quod sublato per baptismum ipso reatu, si tunc à corporibus eorum animæ migrarint,

There were various ancient sects of heretics who denied the necessity of this sacrament: such were the followers of Quintilla of whom Tertullian speaks; <sup>4</sup>—the Manicheans, who argued that water, as well as other material things, was created by the evil being; <sup>5</sup>—the Seleucians and others of the same sort, who, insisting on the text, “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire,” despised baptism with water;—and, not to mention more, the Messalians, who appear to have rejected all sacraments, declaring that perpetual prayer was alone necessary to salvation.

In somewhat later days, a singular notion opposing the necessity of baptism is mentioned in a very famous epistle of pope Zachary, which I extract from, as the propounder of it was a native of these realms. “Interea scripsit reverenda fraternitas tua, reperisse quendam presbyterum genere Scotum, nomine Sampson,

---

protinus in cœlum essent avolaturæ.” *Assert. Lutheran. confut. per rev. patrem Joannem Rof-fensem episc.* fol. xlij. b.

<sup>4</sup> De baptismo. cap. 1. He adds; “Sed nos pisciculi secundum  $\epsilon\chi\theta\upsilon\nu$  nostrum Jesum Christum in aqua nascimur: nec aliter quam in aqua permanendo salvi sumus.”

Before Tertullian, we learn from Irenæus that whilst some heretics mixed oil, &c. with the water, others rejected baptism altogether. “Alii vero hæc omnia

recusantes dicunt, non oportere enarrabilis, et invisibilis virtutis mysterium per visibiles et corruptibiles perfici creaturas: et ea quæ mente concipi non possunt, et incorporalia, et insensibilia, per sensibilia et corporalia.” *Contra hæres. lib. 1. cap. xxi. p. 96.*

<sup>5</sup> “Baptismum in aqua nihil cuiquam perhibent salutis afferre: nec quemquam eorum quos decipiunt, baptizandum putant.” S. Augustin. *de hæres. xlvj. tom. 8. p. 18.*

errantem à via veritatis, dicentem et affirmantem, sine mystica invocatione, aut lavacro regenerationis, posse fieri catholicum Christianum per episcopalis manus impositionem.—Hic autem qui dicit hoc, vacuus est à Spiritu Sancto, et alienus à gratia Christi, atque à consortio sacerdotali abjiciendus. Quis enim, nisi baptizetur juxta præceptum Domini, in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, et sic per manus impositionem consecretur, potest esse catholicus?"<sup>6</sup>

Wickliffe has been said to have held erroneous doctrines upon this point. So Thomas Waldensis asserts; and after him, Tournely and others. Trombelli takes a like view; but I think that the passages cited from Wickliffe's works cannot be interpreted beyond the expression of his own private conjectures as to the final condition of unbaptized infants. Concerning a person so important, I shall give the passages, as they have been cited from his works.<sup>7</sup> "Similiter delato infante fidelium ad ecclesiam, ut secundum Christi regulam baptizetur, et deficiente aqua, vel requisitis aliis, stante pia intentione totius populi, interim mortuo naturaliter nutu Dei: videtur grave, damnationem infantis hujusmodi diffinire, specialiter cum nec infans iste, nec populus peccavit, ut taliter damnaretur. Ubi est ergo misericors liberalitas Christi Dei, si talis proles fidelium propter illud, quod non est in potestate eorum, damnabitur, cum Deus secundum principia

---

<sup>6</sup> *Epist. x. ad Bonifacium. cit.*  
Trombelli. *tom. 1. p. 26.*

<sup>7</sup> Cf. *Doctrinale. cap. xcix.*  
*tom. 2. p. 580.*



theologiæ communia, sit pronior ad præmiandum homines, quam ad damnandum? et specialiter merito, et passione Christi tantum sua tentoria dilatante.” Again. “Dico ad primum istorum objectum, quod videtur mihi probabile, quod Christus satis posset sine lotionе hujus, infantes spiritualiter baptizare, et sic salvare.” Against these passages, we must remember Wickliffe’s positive statement: “Hoc sacramentum est tam necessarium viatori, quia Christus dicit Nicodemo, *Nisi quis renatus, etc.* Ex tanta itaque auctoritate fidei scripturæ sunt fideles generaliter baptizati.”

Among the erroneous conclusions, condemned by the university of Oxford, in the year 1412, and taken from Wickliffe’s writings are the following. The reader will form his own opinion upon them. From his book *de ordine christiano*. “Diffinientes parvulos fidelium sine sacramentali baptismo decedentes non fore salvandos, sunt in hoc stolidi et præsumptuosi.” “Baptismus delet omne peccatum originale vel actuale, mortale aut veniale, quod invenit, sed de veniali omissionis non oportet.”<sup>8</sup>

Within a few years after Wickliffe’s death, the Lollards spoke out plainly. Walsingham tells us, “Eo tempore [1402] Lollardi docuerunt conclusiones execrabiles, in occulto tamen propter metum judiciorum, quæ sunt istæ. 1. Quod septem sacramenta non sunt nisi signa mortua, nec valent in forma qua eisdem

---

<sup>8</sup> Wilkins. *Conc. tom. 3. p. 344. 347.* Compare Collier. *Eccl. Hist. vol. 1. p. 585.*

utitur ecclesia.—5. Item si haberent puerum modo natum, non baptizaretur per manus presbyterorum apud ecclesiam, est enim Sancta Trinitas non contaminata peccato, et pejor esset si deveniret in manus eorundem.”<sup>9</sup>

Bellarmin and Tournely cite a place from Bucer, upon the 3rd chapter of S. Matt. which, however it might be explained away, is nevertheless open to most serious objections: “Pueri prædestinati etiam sine baptismo salvantur, non prædestinati etiam cum baptismo damnantur.”

Calvin, as might be expected, denied the necessity of baptism, inasmuch as he denied the especial grace of it. “It is cleare,” says the old translation, “howe false that is which some haue lately taught, and wherein some yet continue, that by baptisme we be loosed and deliuered from original sinne.” He makes baptism to be nothing more than “an earnest of regeneration,” already received: “a marke—whereby men avowe themselues unto Christ, swear unto His name, and

---

<sup>9</sup> Walsingham. *Ypodigma Nestriæ*. p. 558. Cf. Raynald. *ad an.* 1318. n. XLIV. Foxe allows that this was charged against the Lollards in 1424, namely: “That the sacrament of baptisme used in the Church is but a light matter and of small effect:—and, that Christian people be sufficiently baptized in the bloud of Christ, and need no water; *etc.*” He

denies the truth of the accusation, because “it is not to be thought any to be so ignorant of the Gospel, that ever did or would affirme the same.” *Acts and Monuments*. vol. 1. p. 868. The apologist of the Lollards must be hard pressed, or at least be little learned, when he has no better answer to offer than one so weak as this.

bind their faith before men, that they can no more confesse any other but Christ alone." Hence he perverts the words of Ananias to St. Paul, making Scripture to say, what Scripture does *not* say; "this onely was his meaninge: that thou mayest be assured, Paule, that thy sinnes are forgiuen thee, be baptized."<sup>10</sup>

Nor can I omit to add this, his distinct conclusion of the same chapter. "Infantes are not debarred from the kingdome of heaven, whom it happeneth to departe out of this present life before that it be graunted them to be dipped in water.—The children of the faithfull are not therefore baptised, that they may then first be made the children of God, which before were straungers from the Church, but rather that they be therefore received by a solemn signe into the Church, because by the benefite of the promise they did already belong to the body of Christ."<sup>11</sup> Can any language of the earlier heretics be more plain and decided?

<sup>10</sup> Institutes. *Book.* 4. *ch.* xv. §. 10. 11. 12. 13. 15.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.* §. 22. The Rhemish annotators (S. John. *ch.* iij. v. 5) did not fail to press the charge of Pelagianism on the Calvinists, in consequence of these statements: Dr. Fulke plainly confessed in defending Calvin, that "it is not necessarie in this place by water to vnderstand materiall water." *Confutation*, etc. p. 263. I need scarcely perhaps refer the reader to the fifth book of Hooker: *ch.*

59. in which the catholic doctrine of the English church at that time is explained and asserted upon this point.

The Socinians rapidly carried out the teaching of Calvin: and a refutation of their tenets, by which they made baptism to be not only a mere sign, but even not of perpetual obligation, is to be found in Trombelli, Tournely, and Vossius. The last of these, when opposing the Socinians, speaks soundly enough of the necessity

From these fancies which, in all ages, men have been prone to listen to and propagate, we gladly turn to the consideration of the truth, as it has been constantly insisted on by the Church: namely, that baptism is the only known means by which, ordinarily, we may be saved. I shall lay before the reader some two or three passages from the many which have been collected from the fathers.

First, S. Justin, who in his first apology, declares of baptism, that, we have the reason of it from the apostles, and receive remission of our sins by virtue of the water; “*ἐν τῷ ὕδατι.*”<sup>12</sup>

And S. Irenæus. “*Corpora nostra per lavacrum illam, quæ est ad incorruptionem, unitatem acceperunt; animæ autem per Spiritum.*”<sup>13</sup>

Tertullian, in his same treatise on baptism, so often referred to; “*Lex tinguendi imposita est, et forma præscripta. Ite, inquit, docete nationes, tingentes eas in nomen Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti. Huic*

of baptism: “*illud affirmamus, hoc argumento compulsi, quod Christus ipse præceperit baptismum.*” On the difficult question, what is the result, where baptism cannot be had, he says: “*Hæc nostra sententia est. Quanquam baptismo nos adstringat Deus, ubi haberi potest: non tamen ita externo se symbolo alligare, ut non possit, aut nolit, absque eo hominem salvare.*” *Disp.* vij. §. 1. 17.

<sup>12</sup> *Apolog.* 1. *cap.* 61. *p.* 80.

<sup>13</sup> *Contra hæres. lib.* 3. *cap.* xvij. 2. *p.* 208. Some editions read, “*illud, quod est.*”

“*Lib.* 2. *cap.* xxij. docuerat infantes necessario esse baptizandos. At necessitas ejusmodi non tantum præcepti, cujus illi sunt incapaces, sed medii seu absoluta supponi debet à S. Irenæo. Et vero comparationes quibus utitur in priori testimonio, eo tendunt ut attendenti patebit.” *Tournely, de baptismo. p.* 188.

legi collata definitio illa, Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aqua, *etc.* obstrinxit fidem ad baptismi necessitatem.”<sup>14</sup>

Once more, S. Ambrose:—for there is no need of heaping up authorities upon this point,—“Credit autem etiam catechumenus in crucem Domini Jesu, qua et ipse signatur: sed nisi baptizatus fuerit in nomine Patris, et Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, remissionem non potest accipere peccatorum, nec spiritualis gratiæ munus haurire.”<sup>15</sup>

The important treatise of S. Fulgentius *de baptismo Æthiopis moribundi*, to which I have already had occasion more than once to refer, was written in solution of a doubt proposed to him, upon a case which may be mentioned here. An Ethiopian boy had been carefully taught the rudiments of the Christian faith by his masters, and was enrolled in the Church lists among the number of catechumens who were preparing to receive baptism at the solemn administration at Easter. He had passed through the “scrutinia;” he had been exorcised; had been taught the Lord’s Prayer and the Creed. All the initiatory rites had been performed: in short, as the account states, “simul jam et quid crederet, et quid oraret intelligens, futuro baptismati parabatur.” But on the eve of the great festival he was seized with fever; and, in a senseless state, was car-

<sup>14</sup> *Cap.* xij. *p.* 229.

<sup>15</sup> *De Mysteriis. cap.* iv.

The above quotation is important also, as proving that S. Ambrose could not have intended to

say, as some have argued, that the form in baptism is sufficient, if, “in the name of Jesus” only. See above, *p.* 155.



ried to the church ; where, unable to speak and answer the necessary interrogatories, he was baptized. Shortly after, he died ; ignorant of what had been done. Fulgentius—and we must consent to the correctness of his judgment,—decides that the boy was rightly and properly baptized : and that he truly received remission of his sins and spiritual regeneration. He argues that, as the Scripture has promised that “ he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved,” we cannot doubt of the salvation of such an one, in whom nothing was wanting of the conditions required. “ *Officium secundæ nativitatis in fide, et confessione, effectus autem in regeneratione consistit.*” With what justice therefore, he inquires, can one who has fulfilled the conditions necessary on his part, namely, faith and confession, be debarred from obtaining the effect of baptism, namely, regeneration ? Every labourer is worthy of his hire : and the wages of the grace given in baptism, are not to be denied to him, who has performed the stipulated work. Nor is any stress to be laid upon the fact, that oral pronouncement of belief in such cases cannot be : “ *nihil itaque illi ad æternam beatitudinem consequendam vox ablata nocuit, qui quamdiu potuit, ipsa fidei confessione permansit. Ablata non est, nec mutata : nec abolitum est quod dixit, quando dicere non potuit, quia quamdiu sentire potuit, sententiam non mutavit.*”<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup> *Bibl. Patrum. tom. ix. p. 172. et seqq.* The ninth chapter meets the objection, from the error of baptizing the dead. See above, *p. 3. note 9.*

I have said above that I was not desirous to discuss the difficulty which must immediately occur to us, as to the future condition hereafter of those who, baptism being necessary to salvation, are unable to obtain it. Let us, I repeat, be content with the wise moderation of our Church, that it is “generally” necessary, that is, necessary “where it may be had.” Baptism is the means appointed by our Blessed Lord by which, only, we know that we may be born again, and made heirs of eternal life: and except we are so born again, we cannot enter into the kingdom of God. But, on the other hand, baptism is not an internal qualification or requisite without which, whether in ourselves or from above, it is evident we cannot be saved; such as repentance, faith, justification, and sanctification. Baptism is a sacrament, an outward visible sign ordained by Christ Himself for the very purpose, and the single purpose, of conveying to us inward invisible spiritual graces, necessary to salvation. But the omnipotence of our Lord is not tied down to work solely by those outward and visible means. As at first He might have ordained other means, so now, it is not for one instant to be doubted, He can, if He pleaseth, work independently of, and otherwise than by, them.

Hence therefore, I would not speculate regarding that other class of persons, including thousands and tens of thousands, whose condition is similar in one respect, that they do not receive baptism, yet different in all others, inasmuch as they not only cannot obtain it, but neither desire it, nor have heard of it. In

•

these there can be no explicit wish, no sincere repentance, no faith. They are ignorant,—placed as they are placed in this world, under the inscrutable workings of the Divine Providence,—they are ignorant of the Name of Jesus Christ, and of the tidings of salvation. “How shall they hear without a preacher?” They cannot be condemned, we say, (it is the obvious remark) relying upon the plain dictates of natural justice, for any rejection of means of grace, which have not been offered to them, or for any contempt of a command, which has never been given to them. Nevertheless, we have no right to assert this; however strong, and apparently reasonable, our hope may be. The total silence of the scripture on this subject, is in itself a most significant fact: teaching us, in language not to be mistaken, that it is still to be among the hidden mysteries of God.

I think that in nothing has the moderation of the church of England been shown more clearly, than in her constant avoidance of laying down any decision as to the future condition of infants dying unbaptized. And this, not only during the last two or three centuries; but, so far as I remember, there is not any special notice taken of them, as such, or any speculations entered into concerning them, in her canons and provincial constitutions in former times. I would not be understood too positively, for it is not wise to attempt to prove a negative, and some statement may have escaped my notice. But, I repeat, I do not remember to have observed any remark in the English

Concilia, about infants dying unbaptized, before the sixteenth century. Doubtless there are innumerable articles as to the necessity of baptism; of the grace and the salvation which it conveys; of its being the gate of heaven, and even in one place, (to be presently cited,) that that gate is shut against the unbaptized; and that “Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit he cannot see the kingdom of God.” But, still, no plain, dogmatic decision, that infants dying unbaptized must perish everlastingly: or, on the other hand, that they will be saved by the ways, secret to us, of God’s mercy.

In 1536, for the first time, (as I remember) the “Articles devised by the Kings highnes to stablyshe Christen quietness,” made a deliberate assertion upon this point. “Children by baptism do obtain remission of their sins—and be made thereby the very sons and children of God. Insomuch as infants dying in their infancy shall undoubtedly be saved thereby, and else not.”<sup>17</sup> This sentence was repeated in the Institution of a Christian man, published in the following year: but, in the Necessary Doctrine, put forth in 1543, the article on the sacrament of baptism was remodelled, and this assertion was cancelled; nor has it ever again been, in any way, restored in any of our canons or formularies. It surely must seem to every one little to be regretted that for a few, scarcely for seven, years, the English church forgot, in this respect,

---

<sup>17</sup> Formularies, etc. Oxf. p. xix. 93. 253.

her usual moderation, inasmuch as we have the fact of her quick correction of a statement so hasty and unadvised.<sup>18</sup>

<sup>18</sup> I have already, just above spoken of Wickliffe, and the objections brought against the passages there cited, by several authors: originally by Waldensis: who argues that children, dying unbaptized, certainly perish, and suffer, to some extent, eternally; in his *Doctrinale*, *cap. xcix.* which the student should examine. *Opera. tom. 2. p. 580.* And I am aware that similar statements by canonists and theologians of the middle ages were frequently made: in reliance probably upon the supposed treatise by S. Augustin, *de fide ad Petrum*, now known not to be his. There was, however, much variety in this respect. See the homily of Ælfric, *de baptismo*, *Vindex Eccl. Angl. tom. 3. p. 281.* S. Bernard, *epist. 77.* Gerson, *Opera. tom. 3. p. 18.* cf. *p. 1350.* *Thes. Anec. tom. 5. p. 852, 882.* The Trent catechism, in after years, speaks plainly, "Sed cum cæterarum rerum cognitio, quæ hactenus expositæ sunt, fidelibus utilissima habenda sit; tum vero nihil magis necessarium videri potest, quam ut doceantur, omnibus hominibus baptismi legem à Domino præscriptam esse, ita ut, nisi per baptismi gratiam Deo renascantur, in sempiternam mise-

riam et interitum à parentibus, sive illi fideles, sive infideles sint, procreentur." *p. 108. edit. Aldus.* The reader will at once perceive that the clause, whether faithful or unbelieving parents, refers to the common error then prevalent, (as in modern days) that children of believers are saved whether with or without actual reception of the sacrament. But it is not necessary to discuss this at any length.

I would not omit, however, to notice, as to the belief expressed by members of our own Church, this, by S. Anselm: who admits the condemnation, in some sort, of infants unbaptized, and yet with no certainty (as indeed he could have none) as to the extent of that condemnation. "Non omnes pariter in inferno torqueri mereantur. Nam post diem judicii nullus erit angelus, aut homo, nisi aut in regno Dei, aut in inferno. Ita igitur et peccatum infantium minus est, quam peccatum Adæ; et nullus tamen sine illa universalis satisfactione salvatur; per quam et magnum et parvum dimittitur peccatum." *Opera. p. 104.* It was a little before the time of S. Anselm that Peter Lombard had written of a middle



Before I leave this question altogether, there is one particular regarding it, which I ought to notice.

It has, I may say, been held from the beginning in the Church, as a pious opinion, that the want of baptism in water is supplied, nay, more than supplied, by baptism in blood. Martyrdom, the *baptismus sanguinis*, has been believed always to convey to men, the sure virtue of the *baptismus fluminis*, the probable but, it may be, still doubtful virtue of the *baptismus flaminis*.

Even if it were no more than a mere pious opinion, we should be bound to pay to it due reverence, supported as it is by the voice and judgment of the greatest

state; a *limbus puerorum*, as it was afterwards styled. "Pro peccato originaliquod a parentibus trahitur, parvuli damnabuntur: pro eo nullam aliam ignis materialis vel conscientiae vermis poenam sensuri, nisi quod Dei visione carebunt in perpetuum." *Sentent. lib. ij. dist. 33. E.* Compare the 3rd book of the Decretals, *tit. xlij. cap. 3.* confirming this opinion about the year 1250. "Pœna originalis peccati, est carentia visionis Dei."

For later writers in our church, and for sentiments more in conformity with her own wise moderation, I would refer the reader to the *Reformatio Legum, de hæres. cap. xvij.* to the citation from Jewell's works, in the note above, *p. 23.* to Hooker, *Eccles. Polity.*

*book. 5. ch. lx.* to Field, of the Church: *book. 3. ch. 7.* and Wall, *Infant baptism. vol. 2. ch. vj.*

I must make one more remark: that,—whatever any others (ourselves for example, of the church of England) may think of the clear decisions which some of the later fathers and schoolmen have not hesitated to lay down, in this most mysterious and doubtful question,—at least, the disciples of Calvin cannot accuse such judgments of any want of charity. Pressed to their utmost bounds, those judgments are neither so contrary to the plain words of Holy Scripture, nor so uncharitable, as is his blasphemous heresy of particular and irrespective election to eternal life.

fathers of the Church. But, beyond this, there are texts of S. Scripture which must be considered to have such especial reference to this opinion, that indeed we are warranted in believing that it is a doctrine which "may be proved thereby." Not however that we must regard baptism even by blood to be either a sacrament, or true baptism, of that kind of which our Lord spoke to Nicodemus; that without it no man could enter into the kingdom of heaven. It does not supersede baptism by water; but it supplies the place of it, where, from necessity, the true sacrament cannot be had.<sup>19</sup>

Martyrdom is every punishment inflicted through hatred of the name of Jesus Christ, or of the true doctrine of His Church, and endured unto death, through love of Him, and of purity of the faith, with constancy and patience. It requires therefore two conditions; the punishment and the cause. As to the cause, it must be remembered that the Church has received as martyrs persons who have not suffered directly in behalf of the Faith generally and primarily, but secondarily, and for certain truths of it; as, for example, S. John Baptist, in condemnation of the sin of adultery; many of the virgin saints, in defence of chastity; in later days, and by the church of England, Edward, king of the West Saxons, Thomas archbishop of Canter-

---

<sup>19</sup> "To think that a man whose baptism the crown of martyrdom preventeth, doth lose in that case the happiness which so many thousands enjoy, that only have

had the grace to believe, and not the honour to seal the testimony thereof with blood, were almost barbarous." Hooker, *book 5, ch. lx. §. 5.*

bury, and Charles the first, in defence of the power and privileges of the Church. On the part of the sufferer, it may be either voluntary or involuntary : or rather, as S. Bernard has written, there may be these distinctions ; martyrs in both will and deed ; martyrs, in will only ; martyrs, in deed only. He says “ *Habemus in beato Stephano martyrii simul et opus et voluntatem ; habemus solam voluntatem in beato Joanne ; solum in beatis Innocentibus opus.*”<sup>20</sup>

Concerning all these various cases we may equally appeal to Scripture. Our Blessed Lord made no distinction as to age, or sex, or other qualification of that kind, when He said, “ — he that loseth his life for My sake shall find it.” Or, almost immediately before ; “ Whosoever therefore shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before My Father Which is in heaven.”<sup>21</sup> And with regard to this last text, it is to be noticed that S. Augustin connects it with another in the Gospel, in which we learn the absolute necessity of baptism by water. “ He Who said ” — are the words of that father — “ ‘ Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God,’ the Same said also generally,

---

<sup>20</sup> In Sermone de Innoc. tom. 1. p. 794.

“ *Duobus modis considerari potest martyrium, nempe quatenus est actus voluntarius alicujus virtutis, fortitudinis nimirum ; aut quatenus est simpliciter pœna in odium Christi inflicta. Priori re-*

*spectu dici potest opus operantis : posteriori vero, opus operatum. Soli adulti capaces sunt martyrii, quatenus est opus operantis ; infantes vero, quatenus est opus operatum.*” Tournely, *de baptismo*, p. 219.

<sup>21</sup> S. Matt. ch. x. v. 39. 32.

‘ Whosoever shall confess Me before men, him will I confess also before my Father Which is in heaven.’”<sup>22</sup>  
And, once more, it is written; “ Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends.”<sup>23</sup>

In other places, our Lord, it is to be remembered, used the term baptism with especial reference to death

<sup>22</sup> De civitate Dei. *lib.* 13. *cap.* vij.

In another place, he speaks of the Holy Innocents. “ Etiam infantes illos, qui cum Dominus Jesus Christus necandus quæretur, occisi sunt, in honorem martyrum receptos commendat ecclesia.” *De lib. arbitrio. lib.* 3. *cap.* xxiij. *tom.* 1. *p.* 638.

The puritans, contending against the doctrine of the Church, in the question of the grace given in baptism, found it difficult to avoid the argument drawn from the acknowledged truth, that such grace was supplied by martyrdom. This they especially felt as regarded the Holy Innocents; who, they declared, were saved, if saved at all, by the faith of their parents, “ being within the covenant.” Hence it followed that if any were the children of unbelieving parents or gentiles, they were neither martyrs nor saved. Willet, in his *Synopsis*, cites Macrobius, an obscure author; “ It is not necessary,” he writes, “ to hold

all those children to be martyrs, and so to be saved: for Macrobius writeth, that one of Herod’s sonnes, which was nursed in those parts, was slaine among the rest; the infants which were saved, were within the promise, and belonged to the covenant, and so could not be lost: their salvation depended of their free election before God.” *p.* 569. Compare *p.* 565. “ The children of the faithfull are holy alreadie, euen before they bee baptized: for they are within the couenant.”

On the other hand, compare Taverner’s postil “ on chyldermasse daye.”

I have not Macrobius at hand, but, if I remember rightly, what he records is some jest of the emperor Augustus, when he heard of the slaughter of the young children, and that a son of Herod had been among the number; “ Melius est Herodis porcum esse quam filium.”

<sup>23</sup> S. John. *ch.* xv. *v.* 13.

and suffering for the Faith: "Can ye drink of the cup that I drink of? and be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with?" Also, again, as to the mystery of His own Passion: "I have a baptism to be baptized with; and how am I straitened till it be accomplished."<sup>24</sup> The fathers, commonly, apply these texts to martyrdom: and some add, with S. Cyril of Jerusalem, that martyrs make confession also, according to the words of S. Paul, "being made a spectacle to the world, and to angels, and to men:" in times of peace that we are to be bap-

<sup>24</sup> S. Mark. *ch. x. v. 38.* S. Luke. *ch. xij. v. 50.* Some writers have cited another text, which I submit to the reader, though scarcely to be relied upon, as it appears to me. "And one of the elders answered, saying unto me, What are these which are arrayed in white robes? and whence came they? And I said unto him, Sir, thou knowest. And he said to me, These are they which came out of great tribulation, and have washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." *Rev. ch. vij. v. 13.*

It has been objected that it is wrong to speak of martyrdom as a "baptism of blood," inasmuch as it contradicts the text, "one faith, one baptism." Aquinas defends, as names, the three common scholastic distinctions of baptisms; viz. *aquæ, sanguinis, and flaminis.* "Ad primum dicen-

dum, quod alia duo baptismata includuntur in baptismo aquæ, qui efficaciam habet et ex passione Christi, et ex Spiritu Sancto: et ideo per hoc non tollitur unitas baptismatis. ¶ Ad secundum dicendum, quod sacramentum habet rationem signi: alia vero duo conveniunt cum baptismo aquæ, non quidem quantum ad rationem signi sed quantum ad effectum baptismatis: et ideo non sunt sacramenta." *Summa. pars. III. qu. lxxj. art. xj.*

Returning to the last two texts cited above, many passages in the fathers prove their applicability to the question before us: see Tertullian, *de bapt. cap. xvj.* with the remarks by Le Nourry, *Apparatus ad bibl. max. tom. 2. dissert. iv. art. 4.* and by bishop Kaye, *p. 445.* Also S. Cyprian, *de exhort. martyr.* S. Ambrose, *expos. in ps. 118.*



tized with water, but in times of persecution with our own blood.<sup>25</sup>

If we sought for reasons why martyrdom should be thus regarded, we cannot but thus conclude, following S. Basil.<sup>26</sup> Baptism by water washes away sin, and makes us acceptable in the sight of God, because in it we are (as the apostle writes), “baptized into the death of Jesus Christ, and are buried with Him by baptism into death;”<sup>27</sup> or, as our Church first prays, that in them who are baptized the old Adam may be so buried, that the new man may be raised up in them; and afterwards teaches us, that as Christ died and rose again for us, so we who are baptized, should die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness. All this, however, though in one view real, still in another by a figure and similitude. Not in like manner, the martyrs: they, who have received the baptism of blood, have indeed been baptized into the death of their Lord; and have been “buried with Him by baptism into death;” so actually, so truly, that we cannot doubt, that having been thus “planted together in the likeness of His death, they shall be also in the likeness of His resurrection.”

Hence, again, we may perceive why generally the fathers have spoken of martyrdom as eminent beyond baptism; inasmuch as,—where all the conditions of it

<sup>25</sup> Catech. 3. §. vij.

xxiv. *Bibl. Patrum. tom. 24. p. 1422.*

<sup>26</sup> De Spiritu Sancto. *cap. xv.*

See also, Peter Blesensis, *Serm.*

<sup>27</sup> Romans. *ch. vj. v. 3.*

are fulfilled, including death, so that it is really martyrdom,—it not alone supplies the want of the sacrament, but removes all possibility of after-sin, and introduces the sufferer at once into the glorious company of the redeemed in Paradise.<sup>28</sup>

Nor are the difficulties which have been urged against the common consent of the Catholic Church in this matter, of much weight. It has been said that the outward act of martyrdom cannot add any goodness to the inward act of faith, or love, or sincere repentance: (these last however do not avail alone, without baptism by water, to the remission of sins.) Nay, the apostle has declared, as if with reference to this, “though I give my body to be burned, and have not charity, it profiteth me nothing.” But, whether the act of martyrdom does add effective value and goodness to the inward dispositions of the mind, in such a way as to supply the want of baptism by water, is the very question upon which the Church has recorded her opinion: grounding it upon those promises of her Divine Head which have regard to martyrdom, in the same way as she relies upon His other promises which relate to the sacrament of regeneration. Although,

---

<sup>28</sup> The schoolmen afterwards drew distinctions: for example, Thomas Waldensis. “Si quis autem contendat, majus esse martyrium sacro baptismo, dici potest: etsi secundum se majus est, secundum tamen quod vicariatum

gerit sui minoris, omnino minus est. *etc.*” *Doctrinale, cap. civ. Opera, tom. 2. p. 609.* On the general question see S. Ambrose, *de obitu Valentin.* *Opera, tom. 2. p. 1188.* and the note of his Benedictine editors.

therefore, S. Paul has affirmed that without charity, even martyrdom will not avail, yet he does not deny its effect, if there is charity: nay, rather, we may conclude from his own words, that in such a case martyrdom will so avail. In fact, we must also remember that he was writing to the Corinthians on quite a different subject, and condemning them for their disputes and contentions with one another.<sup>29</sup>

Having thus noticed very briefly the case of those who, under the just decrees of the Most High, depart out of this life, without having received the sacrament of baptism by water,—whether through inability to obtain it, or through ignorance of its being the appointed means of salvation, and of the Divine com-

<sup>29</sup> Nor scarcely, if we consider it, can we imagine that any one should voluntarily undergo death in behalf of the Faith, and for love of our Blessed Lord, unless by the prevenient grace of God (giving him strength in such a cause to suffer pain and punishment) he has been disposed also to the exercise of the true charity of which S. Paul has written. If, as all theologians have taught and all believers have been ever persuaded, the exercise of love towards both God and man is necessary in every one who is about to die, we cannot but as confidently conclude that the Holy Spirit Who hath put it into the heart of a man to believe, and to die for

that belief, should also influence the soul to acknowledge and practise this necessary duty. At least, the innumerable records of the “noble army of martyrs” abundantly shew, that not only were they conspicuous for their constancy and endurance, but, in their last trials, for this above all, “charity.”

See upon this, especially, S. Cyprian, where, speaking of the want of charity, he says, “*Quale delictum est, quod nec baptismo sanguinis potest abluī? quale crimen est quod martyrio non potest expiari?*” *De orat. Dominica. Opera. p. 212.* Compare the homily of Ælfric on the passion of S. Stephen.

mand,—and of those also who have, by martyrdom, been privileged to receive the baptism of blood, we may perceive, as our Church desires us, “the great necessity of this sacrament, where it may be had.” Necessary, not as a mode of testifying our belief in the promises of Christ; nor as evidencing the sincerity of our repentance; nor as a mere seal, upon the part of God, to the forgiveness of sins, and to the blessings of His grace, already bestowed. But, necessary as the only known means by which our sin, whether actual or original, may be mystically washed away; necessary, as the only known means whereby, being (by nature and up to the very instant of our baptism) the children of wrath, we are made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven; necessary, in short, as the only known means by which we can be saved.

## CHAPTER XI.



PROPOSE now to consider a point upon which, probably, there is more variety of opinion, and an allowable variety, than upon any other, which is involved in the subject of this dissertation: namely, at what time the Sacrament of baptism was instituted?

Probably, at present, if the people of our Church were asked this question, the great majority of them would answer, without doubt or hesitation on the matter, that baptism was instituted by our Blessed Lord, when he gave the command to His disciples; “Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, *etc.*” Nor would such an answer be entirely without support; for some of the fathers appear to have believed the same, and S. Leo plainly declares it, in an epistle upon the propriety of deferring the reception of baptism, except upon just reasons, until the great festivals of Easter or Whitsuntide. “*Ad cuius rei confirmationem,*” he says, “*plurimum valet, quod ipse Dominus Jesus Christus postea quam resurrexit a mortuis, discipulis suis, in quibus omnes ecclesiarum præsules docebantur, et formam et potestatem tradidit baptizandi, dicens: Euntes, etc. De quo utique eos etiam ante passionem*



potuisset instruere, nisi proprie voluisset intelligi regenerationis gratiam ex sua resurrectione cœpisse.”<sup>1</sup>

More than this, there is the authority of at least one of the formularies of the church of England, which she has put forth from time to time. For the Necessary Doctrine, published in 1543, lays down: “As touching the holy sacrament of baptism, it is to be noted, first, that this sacrament was instituted and ordained by our Saviour Jesu Christ in the New Testament, as it doth appear by Christ’s own words unto His apostles, [*Matt. xxviii.*] where He saith, “Go ye abroad throughout all the world, *etc.*” And more distinctly in the homilies published in the reign of Elizabeth, we are told: “When Christ did first institute and ordain the sacrament of baptism, He sent His disciples into the whole world, willing them to baptize all nations, *in the Name, etc.*”<sup>2</sup>

But if we enquire into some other documents and formularies of our Church, so far as she has in any way expressed her opinion on this subject, we shall find considerable variety. Thus, six years only before the Necessary Doctrine, the Institution of a Christian man was put forth; or, as it was called, (in distinction to the latter work) the Bishops’ Book. Where, if we can draw any conclusion at all from a somewhat obscure sentence, the institution of the sacrament of

<sup>1</sup> *Tom. 1. p. 464. cit. Tournely. Hom. 28. in Joan. cap. 3.*  
*p. 259. See also, Tertullian, de*

*bapt. cap. xj. xij. S. Chrysostom,*

<sup>2</sup> Homily for Whitsunday.

baptism is referred back to the time of our Blessed Lord's conversation with Nicodemus; and S. John, *Ch.* 3. is quoted in proof of it. And the variation so soon made is the more remarkable, as we know that the two books correspond much with each other, and there can be no doubt that the first was the type of the second.

Passing further back into earlier days, let us take the *Pupilla oculi*. In which work we find several distinctions made. "Baptismus Christi fuit institutus materialiter et inchoative; quando Christus tactu suæ mundissimæ carnis vim regenerativam aquis contulit. Præceptive; quando dixit Nichodemo, nisi quis renatus, *etc.* Effective; quando Christus passus est in cruce. Usus ejus fuit inchoatus; quando misit discipulos suos ad prædicandum et baptizandum. Promulgatus ad omnes; post passionem, Matthæi ult." <sup>3</sup>

Again, Lyndwood: "*Institutum*. Facto sc. et exemplo, quando Christus baptizatus est a Johanne. Verbo autem et præcepto institutum est, quando dixit discipulis suis, *ite baptizate omnes gentes*, *etc.*" <sup>4</sup>

The language of Lyndwood and the *Pupilla* was derived from the fathers, through the schoolmen: who taught that the Matter of the sacrament was appointed, when our Lord was baptized Himself in Jordan. The

<sup>3</sup> *Pars.* II. *cap.* 1.

<sup>4</sup> *Lib.* III. *tit.* 24. Circa sacramentum. Much to the same effect, though more plainly referring the

institution solely to the command after the resurrection; J. de Athon. *Constit. Othobon.* Ingredientibus. *verb.* Salvator.

Form, (upon which it would scarcely be reasonable to doubt, with reference to the public promulgation of it,) after His resurrection, in the often quoted text, *Matt. ch. 28. v. 19.* The end or object, when He said to Nicodemus, “Except a man be born again of water, *etc.*” The effect, when He declared, “He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.” The actual efficacy completed, when from His side there “flowed Blood and Water.”

It is most important to observe, that more than one of the above distinctions are still insisted upon in our ritual. It is there stated that by the baptism of Jesus Christ in the river Jordan, water was sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin;—that He, the most dearly beloved Son, “for the forgiveness of our sins, did shed out of His most precious side, both Water and Blood;”—and the three texts, *S. John, ch. iij. v. 5.* *S. Matt. ch. xxviii. v. 19,* and *S. Mark, ch. xv. v. 16,* are quoted and referred to.

As to the declaration, that all water was sanctified by the contact of the Body of the Divine Redeemer with the waters of the river Jordan, I may remark that it formed a ground of exception taken at the last review of our Book of Common Prayer, in 1662. “It being doubtful,” say the cavilling objectors, “whether either the flood Jordan or any other waters were sanctified to a sacramental use by Christ’s being baptized, and not necessary to be asserted, we desire this to be otherwise expressed.” The bishops in their reply make, it must be owned, a somewhat irrelevant question: “If

Jordan," they ask, "and all other waters be not so far sanctified by Christ, as to be the matter of baptism, what authority have we to baptize?" But they very properly add, "And sure His baptism was *dedicatio baptismi*."<sup>5</sup>

This objection of the puritans was, after all, only a repetition of one made by Bucer against the ritual of 1549: which I think it worth while to quote. "*In prima precatatione super infantem, optarim ista omitti, and by the baptisme of thy wellbeloued sonne, usque, we beseeche thee, etc. quibus verbis memoratur Deum per baptismum sui benedicti Filii Jesu Christi sanctificasse fluentia Jordanis, et omnes alias aquas ad hanc mysticam peccatorum ablutionem. Scriptura enim hæc non prædicat; et servit hæc loquendi forma superstitiosæ opinioni, quasi aquis vis quædam sanctificandi sit baptismate Christi impressa: etc.*" With regard to the statement that we do not learn this fact from Holy Scripture, no one (that I remember) ever pretended to find it there. But it may, nevertheless, be quite true; and both fit and desirable to be insisted upon. It has been well observed, that the great doctrine that our Blessed Lord by His baptism "sanctified water to the mystical washing away of sin," has ever been the constant belief of the whole Church, as still taught by our own. Yet it does not clearly appear in nor was it derived from any passage of the Scripture. "Whether really contained there or no, it could not have been in the first

---

<sup>5</sup> Hist. of Conferences, p. 324. 355.

instance obtained from that source. And yet it was taught by the ancient Church, positively and unhesitatingly, not as a conjecture, but as a doctrine whereof they were fully assured ; not in the way only of eloquent or pious contrast between His baptism and our's, but as a practical truth ; not in order to account for the strangeness of His receiving baptism at the hands of His creature, but as a doctrine relating to us, as a benefit conveyed thereby to His Church."<sup>6</sup>

Besides the above opinions attempting, although variously, to decide the exact period of the institution of the sacrament of baptism, there was another, taking, as it were, a middle course. According to the favourers of this, our Blessed Lord instituted baptism at some uncertain time after He had been Himself baptized by S. John, and before He sent forth His disciples, " by two and two."

It really seems impossible to avoid the conclusion that the sacrament of baptism was not instituted after the Resurrection ; but at some time before the death of our Saviour, possibly at the commencement of His ministry. The assertions of the evangelist, S. John, appear plain to this effect. " After these things came Jesus and His disciples into the land of Judæa ; and there He tarried with them, and baptized."<sup>7</sup> Nor, as to this text, is it without much weight, that it immediately follows the discourse with Nicodemus, when, as

<sup>6</sup> Scriptural views of bapt. *p.*  
280.

<sup>7</sup> S. John. *ch.* iij. *v.* 22.



many have held, the actual institution was made.<sup>8</sup> In which case, if their argument is sound, the evangelist would naturally pass on from the appointment to the observance; and, moreover, the whole course of the narrative, from the record of our Lord's own baptism given by the Baptist in the first chapter, down to the end of this, the third, chapter, does not admit of a great lapse of time, but is to be understood as of almost immediately consecutive events. Hence the phrase "after these things," carries on (so as to include, altogether, no long space of time) the preceding "not many days;" "after this;" "the third day;" "the next day." Whether it be true, however, or not, that it would be to be expected that the evangelist should, in his history, pass on from the institution to the practice, it is certain, that the use of a sacrament either supposes the institution of it at some time previously, or, for the first time, makes it.

There is another text, which is in the next chapter of the same gospel. Upon this, it is almost needless for me to observe, that although it is there distinctly stated that "Jesus Himself baptized not," yet, it is no less clear that "He baptized more disciples than

---

<sup>8</sup> Estius sums up the opinions on this. *Sent. lib. iv. dist. 3. §. xj.* See Catalani, in *Rit. Rom. tom. 1. p. 31.* The authority of S. Bernard is much relied on, in his tract on baptism; (*al. epist. 77.*) in which he insists upon the institution of the sacrament at that

time, and speaks of the condition then laid down by our Saviour, as the "life-giving precept,—the command, still secret, of the new mystery,—the new Law." *Opera. tom. 1. p. 633.* Cf. Scotus. *Sent. lib. iv. dist. 3. quest. iv.*

John," by the ministry of others, "His disciples." It has been said, that the baptism thus given was no other than the baptism of John, which was continued until after the Passion.

But the evangelist, after he has told us that "Jesus baptized," immediately adds that (as a consequence of this) "there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying," that is, about the two administrations. Such a controversy would not have occurred, if the baptisms were the same. Again: if it had been the baptism of John, it would hardly have been so plainly said that "Jesus baptized;" but rather, the Baptist himself. Hence S. Augustine concluded, "*Ipsius erat baptismi sacramentum, ad discipulos autem ministerium pertinebat.*"<sup>9</sup>

Returning to those who fix on particular facts in our Lord's life, for the institution of baptism, some, of whom Duns Scotus seems the chief,<sup>10</sup> think it took place when He sent forth the twelve, to preach and to say "The kingdom of heaven is at hand:" and that as then He gave them power to heal the sick, and raise the dead, and cast out devils, so also He gave them their commission to baptize. I am not inclined to agree with this supposition. Others, again, and with more probability declare the institution to have

<sup>9</sup> Epist. 265. *Ad Seleucianum*.  
Compare also, *Tract.* xv. in  
*Joan.* §. 3.

<sup>10</sup> Reportat. Paris. lib. iv. dist.  
ij. quæst. 1. And before him,  
Lombard. lib. iv. dist. iij. F.

been when our Lord was Himself baptized. And certainly there are many of the fathers, who declare, as does our own ritual now, that then water was set apart as the matter of this sacrament; in other words, “sanctified to the mystical washing away of sin:” and the form also signified. Thus S. Augustine speaks of the Father in the voice from heaven, the Son in the Man Christ Jesus, and the Holy Spirit “descending from heaven like a dove.”<sup>11</sup> Again, S. Ambrose: in the place already cited; how the Lord was baptized, not desiring to be Himself purified, but to purify the waters.<sup>12</sup>

Here comes in a question concerning which very much has been written, and upon which I shall content myself with stating some only of the chief distinctions which have been given, and the arguments on both sides. It being evident that the baptism of John was not the same with the baptism instituted (whensoever it was) by our Blessed Lord, in what did the difference consist?

The later followers of Luther may be accused of almost explaining away all distinction between the two: and this seems to have been a natural result of their doctrine, which demanded faith only as a means of salvation, and emptied the sacraments, if we may so speak, of their powers of conveying grace. Hence

<sup>11</sup> Tr. vj. in Joan.

<sup>12</sup> In Luc. *lib.* 2. *n.* 83. So S. Jerome; “Dominus noster Jesus Christus non tam mundatus est in

lavacro, quam in lavacro suo universas aquas mundavit.” *Adv. Lucif. tom.* 2. *p.* 178. Cf. Bedæ, *hom.* 23, *Opera*, *tom.* 5. *p.* 164. 166.

they taught that Christian baptism exceeds and differs from the baptism of John, only in the greater abundance of the spiritual gifts which it testified to and sealed.<sup>13</sup> Luther himself, however, affirmed three reasons of distinction. That the one was not a sacrament; that it did not remit sins; and that they who had received it, were again baptized with the baptism of our Lord.<sup>14</sup> On the other hand Melancthon taught, that the whole difference consisted in the Baptist's preaching and requiring belief in Christ who was about to suffer; but the apostles, after the resurrection, in Him who had died and risen again: that, accordingly, the administration and the effects were alike in both.<sup>15</sup>

Vossius in his eighth disputation argues against Bellarmin at considerable length, and whilst he allows

---

<sup>13</sup> Nor indeed was this difference, even in degree, always insisted on. Reineccius asserted the two baptisms to be identical, "respectu causæ efficientis, materialis, formalis, ac finalis." *Armatura. tom. 4. cap. xvij. p. 197.* Grauer declares it to be an absurdity to suppose any distinction between them, either of substance or efficacy. *In absurd. Calv. cap. 4. §. 69.* So Zuingle, whether as to essence, effect, or end. *de vera et falsa religione, cap. de bapt.* To the same purpose perhaps Musculus, in his common-places, *tom. 1. p. 617.* and Beza, *lib. quæst. et respons. p. 344.*

<sup>14</sup> *De baptismo Legis, etc.*

<sup>15</sup> *In locis comm. tit. de bapt. tom. 1. p. 236.* In another place he argues, that, because in both, faith was required, therefore the effect was the same; and that the blessings conveyed by the one, were equal to those by the other. "Sic fide proderat baptismus Joan. sicut postea prodest baptismus apostolorum." *tom. 3. p. 10.* Compare his exposition of the first ch. of S. John. *ibid. p. 618.* Compare also Chemnitz, *Examen. pars. II. p. 37.* and the Magdeburgh centuriators. *lib. 1. p. 362.*

a superiority to the baptism of Christ, yet makes it to consist rather in degree than in kind, and admits but some slight and unimportant difference. Bellarmin had said, that the baptism of John was instituted by himself: because it is always so spoken of, as John's baptism: his, not merely as the administrator, but as the author of it. I think that we must agree with Vossius, that this cannot be true: (indeed Bellarmin qualifies it in a succeeding sentence, applying the authorship to the rites observed, more than to the baptism:<sup>16</sup>) for the Holy Baptist thus speaks: "He that sent me to baptize with water, the Same said unto me, *etc.*" And the evangelist S. Luke declares, that before he commenced his ministry, "the word of God came unto John in the wilderness." To the same purpose we may justly interpret the question of our Blessed Lord; "The baptism of John, whence was it? from heaven, or of men?"<sup>17</sup>

Calvin also, having first stated his own notion that repentance in baptism means regeneration, and forgiveness of sins means washing, concludes it to be *therefore* most certain, that the ministry of John was altogether the same which was afterward committed to the apostles. And he asks; who against this doctrine "will hearken to S. Chrysostom denying that forgiveness of sins was comprehended in the baptism

<sup>16</sup> De baptismo, *cap.* xx.

<sup>17</sup> S. John. *ch.* j. *v.* 33. S. Luke. *ch.* iij. *v.* 2. S. Matt. *ch.* xxj. *v.* 25.

Bellarmin makes but a faint reply to these texts, which he notices as grounds of objection. *ibid.*



of John; or to that subtilty of Augustine, that in the baptism of John, sins were forgiven in hope, but in the baptism of Christ they are forgiven in deed?"<sup>18</sup> The truth is that Calvin, in all this, intended to insinuate that forgiveness of sins was not a grace given in either the one baptism or the other.

Vossius (who may be regarded as among the chief exponents of the opinions of his school upon this question) does not hesitate to declare that the two baptisms were alike in the form used: and that S. John baptized in the name, i. e. with the confession, and invocation, of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit.<sup>19</sup> It is of course uncertain whether S. John used any form; and if he did, in what words it was expressed. S. Ambrose,<sup>20</sup> and after him various fathers and the schoolmen,<sup>21</sup> hold that it was probably "in the Name of the Messiah about to come."

<sup>18</sup> Instit. *book. 4. ch. 15. §. vij.*

<sup>19</sup> Others, however, who held that the forms were the same, nevertheless had a different idea of their identity: either, that both S. John and the apostles baptized "In the name of Jesus;" or, that "there was the same form in both, the word of God, for John also taught the people to believe in Jesus Christ." Willet. *Synopsis. p. 585.* Vossius himself in a succeeding section, as I remark presently, qualifies, and hesitates about, his own statement. That he is not altogether without support in his notion, and that I have

not unfairly interpreted his meaning, may be proved from the Centuriators, who speak of the form in John's baptism having been vitiated, by the omission of the name of the Holy Spirit. *lib. 2. p. 354. cf. p. 496.*

<sup>20</sup> De Spiritu. S. *lib. 1. cap. iij.* See Basnage, *Annal. tom. 1. p. 240.* and Lightfoot, *Horæ Hebr. in Matt. ch. iij.*

<sup>21</sup> Following Lombard. *Sent. lib. iv. dist. 2. F.* I would remark that bishop Bull merely declares that John did not baptize "in the Name of the Father, etc." *Works. vol. 2. p. 16.*

An objection has been raised to this ; namely, that if it had been so our Blessed Lord Himself would have received the rite under that form. I scarcely think it to be a difficulty of much importance, because His reception of baptism was in the completion of a deep mystery, and “to fulfil all righteousness.” Or, again, the baptism of John not being a sacrament in the same sense as are the sacraments of the Gospel, it was not necessary that it should be always given under a determinate form of words ; and, therefore, in the case of the Saviour Himself, Whom the Baptist knew and recognized, the rite might have been performed, without using any words whatever. The inquiry, however, which the Jews made of S. John, is more to the purpose, though even this, far from conclusive. “Who art thou ? And he confessed and denied not ; but confessed, I am not the Christ. And they asked him, What then ?”<sup>22</sup> It would seem to have been unlikely that they should have doubted whether S. John were the Christ, if he indeed baptized “in the name of the Messiah about to come.”

How utterly unreasonable the supposition of Vossius is, is shown by his own contradiction of himself in the next page : having, as I have just said, carefully explained how we are to understand his own words, he assures us that he is, nevertheless, not so to be understood ; “*Sed sententia est, Joannem non in suo, sed Dei nomine, qui personarum ratione est trinus, semper baptizasse.*”

---

<sup>22</sup> S. John. *ch. i. v. 20.*

Indeed there is plain evidence, that S. John could not have used such a form, as Vossius has asserted above. Because in the Acts of the apostles, we read as follows: and I cite the whole passage, as the last verse bears upon a point just mentioned; “—they said unto him, we have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost. And he said unto them, Unto what then were ye baptized? And they said, Unto John’s baptism. Then said Paul, John verily baptized with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him Which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.”<sup>23</sup>

Calvin, Vossius, and the rest, insist that the gift of the Holy Ghost was given, not only in the baptism instituted by our Lord, but in that administered by S. John, though in a less degree. Now, not to speak of the uniform consent of the fathers to the contrary, it is strange that these writers should have overlooked the force of the following passages of the New Testament: unless we acknowledge, (which I am not prepared to dispute,) that it is a characteristic of the theology which appeals to Scripture and to Scripture only, that it makes Scripture mean exactly according to the particular fancies and theories of its teachers.

For S. John has himself explained that one distinction between the two was, that his baptism did *not* convey that spiritual gift. “I indeed baptize you with water unto repentance: but He that cometh after me

---

<sup>23</sup> *Ch. xix. v. 2.*

—shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire.”<sup>24</sup> And, as if to prove that this promise did not entirely relate, as some will have it, to the outpouring and the fiery tongues upon the day of Pentecost, S. Mark omits the reference to that miracle, simply recording that the Baptist, in his more usual preaching, spoke only of that gift which was to be the accompaniment, through all ages, of the baptism of Christ; namely, the Holy Ghost. “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost.”<sup>25</sup>

But there is one testimony to an essential difference between the two, which to me is conclusive. Disciples were baptized afresh, who had received the baptism of S. John. In the Acts, in the place cited above, after S. Paul had explained to the Ephesian converts the difference which distinguished the baptism of S. John, this fact is immediately added; “When they heard this, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus.” S. Jerome justly concludes that the first administration was imperfect; in other words, that it could not have conveyed those spiritual blessings which are alone to be obtained by reception of the Christian sacrament. “*Joannis baptisma in tantum imperfectum fuit, ut constet postea Christi baptismate baptizatos, qui ab eo fuerant baptizati.*”<sup>26</sup>

Calvin was determined to find some reply to the evidence in this narrative of the sacred historian: and

---

<sup>24</sup> S. Matt. *ch.* iij. *v.* 11.

<sup>25</sup> *Ch.* i. *v.* 8.

<sup>26</sup> Adv. Lucif. §. vij. *tom.* 2.  
*p.* 179.

I do not suppose that in the whole range even of that most unscrupulous author's writings, there is any more flagrant example than this of his utter contempt of the words of Holy Scripture, when fairly pressed by them. "I deny," he says, "that they were baptized again." It is all one to him that S. Luke declares that they were baptized. "I deny it.—I understande it to be the baptisme of the Holy Ghost, that is to say, that the visible graces of the Spirit were given to them by the laying on of handes." This (if it means anything) means, that whereas the Scripture tells us of two circumstances, baptism and confirmation, Calvin rejects the one as a false statement, and makes "the latter sentence to describe, what manner of baptism" the first sentence mentions, i. e. baptism of the Holy Ghost.<sup>27</sup>

I must refer the reader if he wishes to learn other, and more ingenious, methods of evading the sacred history, to the eighth disputation of Vossius, who himself inclines to believe that S. Luke, after all, only intended to inform us that these Ephesian disciples received a further supply of Divine grace, at the hands of S. Paul. Which, in short, amounts to little else than the plainer speaking of Calvin.

The doctrine of the church of England, in 1550, and fully agreeable to catholic consent, is declared in the Postills which were published in that year. We are told that, "S. John putteth a difference betwene his baptisme and the baptisme of Christ, when he

---

<sup>27</sup> Instit. *book. 4. ch. 15. §. xviiij.*



saith: I baptise in water and preach penance. But Christ doth not only baptize in water, but also forgeueth syn, and sendeth the holy ghost. Mark here that S. John putteth no difference between y<sup>e</sup> outward signe of water that he ministreth, and the same that Christ vseth. The exterior sign, both of Christ and S. John is al one.—Christ doth also by his owne power, forgeue synnes, and send the holy ghoste.”<sup>28</sup> In like manner, some years before, Taverner justly draws the distinction which exists between the two. “Grace and sanctification were figured by the baptisme wherewith S. Jhon baptised. But the baptisme of Jesus Christe—is the baptisme of spirite and of lyfe, and the true sanctification or hallowynge.”<sup>29</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> “The Gospell on the fourth Sondaye in Aduent.” *Exposition*. sign. c. v.

This is a very valuable book, and I conceive that it has remained unnoticed, only on account of its extreme scarcity, which has rendered it altogether unknown. There is not a copy in either the Bodleian or Museum or Lambeth libraries. Nor do I remember to have seen it referred to in any work whatever. And yet it represents, at a period, perhaps, the most important that can be named in our ecclesiastical annals, the received doctrine at that time of the church of England. I shall not here discuss the exact amount of authority under which it was published: but I shall transcribe

the title; which will be quite sufficient (I am confident) to enable the learned reader to estimate it justly. “A Postill or Collection of moste godly doctrine vpon every gospell through the yeare, as well for Holye dayes as Sondayes, dygested in suche order, as they bee appoynted and set forthe in the booke of Common Prayer. Verrye profytable for all Curates, Parientes, maysters of housholdes, and other gouerners of youth. *Cum privilegio*. Londini. Anno Domini. M. D. L.” 4 to. Reynold Wolfe.

I need scarcely remind the reader that this book was compiled to accompany the first Common Prayer Book of 1549.

<sup>29</sup> Oxford edit. p. 21. cf. p. 64.

I should desire to end this part of my subject with one or two passages from the fathers. And first, S. Augustine. In his fifth book against the Donatists he says, “*Jam nunc de baptismo Johannis videndum est quid dicatur. Baptizatos enim a Paulo eos qui jam baptismo Johannis baptizati fuissent, legimus in actibus apostolorum; non ob aliud, nisi quia Johannis baptismus non fuit Christi baptismus, sed Johanni a Christo concessus, qui Johannis proprie diceretur, etc.*”<sup>30</sup> And soon after, in the next chapter, he continues: “*Quæro itaque, si baptismo Johannis peccata dimittebantur, quid amplius præstare potuit baptismus Christi eis quos apostolus Paulus post baptismum Johannis Christi baptismo voluit baptizari? — Quapropter quamquam ita credam baptizasse Johannem in aqua pœnitentiæ in remissionem peccatorum, ut ab eo baptizatis in spe remitterentur peccata, re ipsa vero in Domini baptismo id fieret.*”<sup>31</sup>

So S. Ambrose, in the second book of his commentary on the gospel of S. Luke, upon the words of S. John, “*I baptize you with water.*” “*Non enim aqua omnis ablutio est, sed hæc inter se divisa esse non possunt; et ideo aliud fuit baptisma pœnitentiæ, aliud gratiæ est.*”<sup>32</sup> Once more, Tertullian: “*Baptismus*

<sup>30</sup> *Cap. ix. §. 10. tom. ix. p. 146.*

<sup>31</sup> *§. 12.*

<sup>32</sup> *Opera. tom. 1. p. 1307. §. 79.* Compare his preface to the 37th psalm. “*Audistis hodie legi*

*quia Johannes baptizabat in Ænon, juxta Salim. Ænon dicitur oculus suppliciorum: Salim ipse ascendens; hoc habet interpretatio. Qui ergo baptizari eligit, supplicia prævidet; et ideo confugit ad bap-*

ab Ioanne denuntiatus jam tunc habuit quæstionem, ab ipso quidem Domino propositam Pharisæis, cœlestis ne is baptismus esset, an vero terrenus? de quo illi non valuerunt constanter respondere, utpote non intelligentes, quia nec credentes. Nos porro, quantula fidesumus, tantulo et intellectu possumus æstimare, divinum quidem eum baptismum fuisse, mandatu tamen non et potestate, quod et Ioannem à Domino missum legimus in hoc munus, cæterum humanum conditione.”<sup>33</sup>

Other fathers, whom I shall not quote at length, testify to the same truth: Firmilian, that there cannot be a spiritual birth without the Spirit; and so S. Paul baptized anew, with a spiritual baptism, those who had been baptized by John before the Spirit was sent by the Lord. And S. Jerome, having inquired what more we can obtain from the baptism of Christ, if John's baptism remitted sins; plainly declares that the baptism of John was imperfect. And Origen denies the baptism of S. John to have been in Christ, that is, with the gifts and graces of His baptism, but that which is in the law. And S. Chrysostom, in more than one place, that it was imperfect; indeed, destitute of the grace of the Spirit. And S. Basil;

---

tismatis sacramentum, ut peccatum omne deponat, ne obnoxius incipiat esse suppliciiis. Et forte supplicia prævidet qui baptizatur baptismo pœnitentiæ: at vero ille gratiam spectat, qui baptizatur in

Christo. Baptismus ergo Johannis, oculus suppliciorum est: baptismus Christi, oculus gratiarum.”  
*Opera. tom. 1. p. 815.*

<sup>33</sup> De baptismo. *cap. x. p. 227.*

that it was introductory and signified departure from sins. And S. Gregory, that John baptized not with the Spirit, but with water; because, unable to remit sins, he washes the bodies of the baptized with water, but not their minds with forgiveness. And, lastly, S. Leo: that the grace and the ground of John's baptism was other than the Christian, nor did it appertain to that virtue, whereby, through the Holy Spirit, they are reborn, of whom it is said, "who were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."<sup>34</sup>

And to those great names I would add that of our own Bede. "Baptizabat [Joannes] baptismo pœnitentiæ in confessionem et emendationem peccatorum, et prædicabat baptismum pœnitentiæ futurum in Christo in remissionem peccatorum: in cujus solo baptismo peccatorum remissio nobis donatur, apostolo attestante. — Quod si quærimus quare Joannes baptizaverit, cujus baptismo peccata remitti nequiverunt; patet aperta ratio, quia præcursionis suæ servans officium, ita etiam baptizare debebat, etc."<sup>35</sup> Once more, of the Anglo-saxon church, archbishop Ælfric: "John's baptism

---

<sup>34</sup> These and many other passages to the same effect, which are cited over and over again in the controversies upon this subject, are collected together in the well-known work, "Scriptural views of Holy Baptism:" to which I would refer the reader. *p.* 247-260.

For later writers see Gerson, *de vita spirituali*. Opera. tom. 4. *p.* 5. tom. 3. *p.* 218. Waldensis. Opera. tom. 2. *p.* 576. 643. Duns Scotus. *Reportat. Paris. lib.* iv. *dist.* ij. *quæst.* 2.

<sup>35</sup> Homil. 48. Opera. tom. 5. *p.* 368. cf. *p.* 274.

wrought no forgiveness of sin, for he was God's messenger, [he wæs Godes bydel] and not God."—"John's baptism washed the man without, and not within, for he gave no forgiveness of sin, as Christ did through the Holy Ghost."—"What baptism did John give? his own baptism, with no forgiveness of sin, but for repentance and a preparation to the baptism of Christ. Those men whom John baptized were baptized again in Christ's baptism, because they could not be saved through the baptism of John."<sup>36</sup>

To conclude this in the words of a very learned author: "The two baptisms could scarcely be more distinct; the one, the baptism of John; the other, by whatsoever human agent administered, uniformly and equally, the baptism of the Lord; the one, the baptism of repentance, looking onward only to One coming, Who should remit sins; the other, the baptism into Him, Who remitteth them, into His own saving, all-prevailing Name; the one, a baptism, in which they "knew not whether there be any Holy Ghost;" the other, a baptism, in which "the Holy Ghost came upon them," and dwelt in them, and manifested His presence within them.—The baptism of John was preparatory, the baptism of Christ perfective; the baptism of John invited to repentance, the baptism of Christ gave grace upon repentance; the baptism of

---

<sup>36</sup> Homilies. *vol. 1. p. 353. vol. 2. p. 39. 49.* The last in almost the words of Eusebius against

Sabellius. *Bibl. patrum. tom. iv. p. 2. F. cf. p. 421. G.*



John stood on the confines of the promised land, was allowed to see it, led men to the borders of it, guided them to it, but itself brought them not into it; higher than the law, as he whose baptism it was, was greater than any born of the sons of men, yet less also than the least in the kingdom of heaven: greater than the baptisms of the law, as being nearer to the Redeemer, but yet restrained within the precursorial office, still a shadow of the good things to come, not the reality itself, though brought so near to the Sun of righteousness, as all but to be kindled with His beams; as all but to convey that which could only be conveyed by Him, in Whom alone, as being God as well as man, we could be re-born as sons of God; Who alone shed His precious Blood for the sins of the whole world, and in baptism washes and cleanses His Church with It.”<sup>37</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup> Scriptural views, *etc.* p. 245. 249.

Other distinctions might be added: such as, for example, that the baptism of John was not a sacrament, which, *per se*, conferred grace; nor was it instituted, that it should remain always in the Church, as the means by which alone men might be admitted into it. Indeed, some have argued, that it ceased altogether, when the Baptist was cast into prison. Some of the schoolmen certainly speak of it as a sacrament, but this, in a wide and im-

proper sense; as a symbol or image of the sacrament about to be instituted: or, in the same way with Tertullian, as something occupying an intermediate ground between the old and the new dispensations: a point at which Judaism ceased, and Christianity began. *Adv. Marc.* iv. 33. Nor again, like the Christian sacrament, did John's baptism convey to those who received it, an indelible character: nor was it given to any but adults, who could listen to and obey the preaching of repentance.

If it should be asked, how is it that the apostles were not themselves baptized again, (if we are to suppose that they had received the baptism of John, which could not convey remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Spirit,) we must remember that the gospels say nothing as to the baptism which they did really receive. S. Augustin concludes from the words of our Blessed Lord, “He that is washed needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit; and ye are clean, but not all,” that they had received the baptism of Christ.<sup>38</sup> Nor is the universal doctrine of the church,—that baptism is the necessary entrance into, and the first beginning of the spiritual life,—to be overlooked in the consideration of this question: for, from that we may reasonably understand, that as the apostles received the Holy Eucharist at the Last Supper, so also they had been previously baptized with the baptism of Christ. It is true, that our Blessed Lord might have dispensed

---

<sup>38</sup> De anima. lib. 3. cap. ix. tom. x. p. 379.

The same also is urged by him in his epistle to Seleucian, and by Tertullian in his treatise on baptism. The mere fact of the sacred records being silent does not prove anything; and we have no account given us of the baptism of the first members of the churches of Rome, Galatia, or Ephesus: nor of S. Timothy, or S. Titus. Nor is it a light consideration, that, our Blessed Sa-

viour having declared baptism to be necessary to salvation, it is not probable, without direct evidence of the fact, that the apostles should not have received it. We know not why any exception should have been recognized as regarded them.

See a discussion of the question in the dialogues of Hugo, archbishop of Rouen. *Thes. Anecdotes*. tom. 5. p. 956. in which the doctrine of the middle ages is given: agreeing with S. Augustine.

with baptism in their case : but, whilst there is, on the one hand, authority against this supposition, there is, upon the other, no proof whatever of the fact of such a dispensation.<sup>39</sup> But, in short, the question must be left undecided ; there is no statement either the one way or the other in the Scriptures, which can lead to any certain conclusion : and, after all, the case of the apostles,—upon whom the visible descent of the Holy Ghost came ; who were elected, and especially called, and afterwards so immediately with our Lord, that He might possibly have seen fit to have conveyed to them the grace of regeneration in some other way than by the baptism of water,—is not one from which we can

<sup>39</sup> According to a very ancient tradition in the Church, it was said, that our Saviour Himself baptized S. Peter only : S. Peter baptized S. Andrew and the sons of Zebedee : and they, the rest of the apostles. See, against this tradition, Basnage, *Annal. tom. 1. p. 273.*

Chemnitz insists that the apostles must have been baptized, but he denies with any other than John's baptism : straining beyond its due bounds the famous text John, *ch. 4, v. 2.* and concluding *therefore* the ancient tradition to be an apochryphal fable. *Ex-amen conc. Trid. pars. II. p. 39.* But the evangelist is there declaring the rule, and exceptions might be both expected and allowed.

Or, more probably : after our Blessed Lord had Himself administered His baptism to one or more of the apostles, He might have determined in future only to use the ministry of others : and, therefore, the evangelist may well be understood according to the obvious and first meaning of his words. Compare the bishop of Lincoln's account of S. Clement of Alexandria. *p. 442.*

The question of the baptism of the Blessed Virgin is also one on which the Scripture is silent. There are certainly reasons why, as regards her, the Mother of God, we may believe that an exception should have been made. But I am not called upon to enter into the subject in this place.

fairly argue, or which bears upon the question of the essential differences which distinguish the two baptisms.

I have scarcely, in what has just been said, more than glanced at the enquiry whether the apostles received our Lord's baptism : nor do I pass on so quickly from it, for any other reason than that it does not affect the main subject of our discussion. I cannot agree with those, who regard it as a trifling question ; as if any thing can be trifling which is mixed up with, or serves to explain, the deep mysteries of our holy Faith. The scriptures indeed are silent upon this as on many other points, on which we might perhaps beforehand have expected information. But we are not therefore hastily to assume that we are not to exercise ourselves, with all prudence, in searching out the fact, or at least the probabilities, of the case. And I must confess that it gives me pain to remember that a very learned bishop, speaking of the baptism of the apostles, has slightly dismissed the consideration of it. "It is amusing," we are told, "to observe how greatly the ancients were perplexed with this difficulty ; and to what expedients they had recourse in order to get rid of it. They argued, for instance, that Peter was baptized, when he attempted to walk upon the sea ; and the other apostles, when the waves broke over the vessel in the storm on the lake of Gennesareth."<sup>40</sup> Would that we might be quite sure, that

---

<sup>40</sup> Ecclesiastical hist. of the 2nd and 3rd Centuries, illustrated from

Tertullian, *p.* 443. The very learned prelate does not add that

the poverty of our theological literature during the last century and a half has not been owing to this general opinion that many questions, involving vital doctrines, are merely “amusing;” an opinion bringing with it its fatal and most sure consequences; a disparagement of objective truth; a confusion of creeds; barren recommendations of some few moral duties agreed upon by most of us; and vapid dissertations on certain articles of belief thought to be important, solely because no man happens to dispute them.

One other enquiry, however, remains. Why did our Blessed Lord desire to receive baptism Himself at the hands of S. John? This is indeed a mystery, which with all reverence we must desire only so far to comprehend, as the Scriptures have revealed it to us: and this is but to a small extent. The holy Baptist would have forbid Him, saying, “I have need to be baptized of Thee, and comest Thou to me?” And from the answer we may collect one reason why it should be so: “for thus it becometh us,” said our Lord, “to fulfil all righteousness.”<sup>41</sup>

these two arguments, if arguments they might be called, are produced by Tertullian himself, and, (whilst he speaks reverentially of the doubt as to the baptism of the apostles,) rejected by him as being sufficiently forced.

<sup>41</sup> “Sic enim decet nos prærogare exemplum implendæ omnis justitiæ, ut videlicet discant fideles

neminem posse hominem absque unda baptismatis perfecte justum existere, et esse omnibus quamvis innocenter et juste viventibus necessarium vivificæ regenerationis officium, cum me qui Spiritus Sancti opere conceptus et natus, cognoverint secundæ nativitatis subiisse, vel potius mihi concessasse lavacrum.” Bedæ, *homil.* 23. *Opera. tom. 5. p. 165.*



Vossius suggests that our Lord was thus, as Man obedient to the Divine command, baptized, in order that, as having been admitted into the Jewish church by circumcision, He might so be made a member of the Christian church: “ita etiam baptismum suscipere conveniebat, ut eo pacto jungeretur populo Christianorum.”<sup>42</sup> A most miserable and unworthy reason! even if we do not insist upon the evident absurdity of it. Nor is it to be passed over, viewed as a characteristic of the school which that writer represents; willing to propose and to adopt anything and everything, however novel, which might contradict the long established opinions of the fathers of the Church. Such as that of S. Jerome, that by thus being baptized, our Lord confirmed and set His seal to the baptism of John, as being good and of divine authority:<sup>43</sup> or, of S. Augustine, that He might shew forth and prefigure the baptism which He was about to institute:<sup>44</sup> or of the ancient hymn, following S. Gregory, that purifying us He might remove our sins, and destroy the old Adam in that flood:<sup>45</sup> or, chiefly, that He might there

---

<sup>42</sup> The Centuriators speak in much the same way: “Plures causæ sunt:—nimirum, ut ea cæremonia à Deo et hominibus ad suam functionem initiaretur; etc.” *Lib. 1. cap. x. p. 296.*

<sup>43</sup> In *Matt. cap. 3.* So Melancthon, on the gospel of S. Matt. *tom. 3. p. 261.*

<sup>44</sup> *De Trinitate. lib. xv. cap. 26.*

<sup>45</sup> Hymn for the Epiphany.

“Lavacra puri gurgitis,  
Cœlestis Agnus attigit,  
Peccata, quæ non detulit,  
Nos abluendo sustulit.”

Compare for these and other reasons which have been proposed, Bellarmin, *de bapt. cap. xxij.*

sanctify water to the mystical washing away of sin, which has been already insisted on, and the authorities adduced.<sup>46</sup>

I return now to the consideration of the time of the institution of this sacrament. The distinctions, and they are essential, between the baptism of our Lord and that administered by S. John, have been explained : and I have noticed the opinions given by various writers as to the actual period of institution, supposing and concluding it to have been prior to the death of the Redeemer, whether at His own baptism in Jordan, or at the discourse with Nicodemus, or at some intermediate or subsequent time.

I am inclined to consent with those who believe that the institution of the Christian sacrament in reality took place when our Blessed Saviour was Himself baptized. We have in that fact, according to the primitive and constant and universal testimony of the Catholic Church, the hallowing of the matter of the

<sup>46</sup> So also S. Anselm ; whom, however, I specially name here, because in the same place, he explains why S. John baptized many others, besides our Blessed Lord. "Quia si solum Dominum baptizasset, non deessent qui putarent sanctius fuisse baptismum Joannis, quam Christi, quasi baptismum Joannis solus Christus meruisset baptizari ; baptismum autem Christi, genus humanum. — Atque ita major videretur baptismus servi,

quam baptismus Domini. *etc.*" *Homil. in evang. sec. Luc. Opera.* p. 173. Compare Ælfric. *Homilies.* vol. 2. p. 47. *On the Epiphany.* In the same homily he gives the humility of our Lord as the reason why He "vouchsafed to bow His holy head to the hands of His servant." p. 41. See also, Alcuin, who offers three reasons, already noticed : *de div. Off. Bibl. Patrum. Auct. tom. 1.* p. 230.

sacrament, by the contact of His Sacred Person with the waters of Jordan: and, though it may not have been plainly expounded and declared by Jesus to His disciples before His resurrection, we have the form, in the Three Persons then manifested, in Whose Name all baptisms after its publication were to be conferred. It is true that very shortly afterwards our Lord declared to Nicodemus the greatness of the necessity which should be laid on all men to receive His baptism: but the privacy of that intercourse (private as regarded its then occurrence, in the darkness and silence of the night, not in its after communication to the whole world through the holy evangelist,) was not, if we may presume to judge, so fitting an occasion for the actual institution of the sacrament of baptism, as were the day-time, and the solemn reception by the Son of Man of the rite administered by His forerunner, and the open heavens, and the Voice of the Eternal, and the Spirit of God descending like a dove,—the Three Persons, the One God,—All in One, testifying to, completing, and confirming what was then being done, and what was ever after to be done, by all men, unto the end of the world.

Nor are the objections which have been brought against this view, of much weight; at least the answers to them appear to me to be sufficient. In such enquiries, to determine which we have not the plain and precise words of Holy Scripture, we must be content to arrive, if it may be, at that decision which seems to be the most reasonable. Certainty is not to be ex-

pected, nor is it requisite : were it so, we should have received it. And it will be well for the reader to reflect whether long established notions, (scarcely so often examined as adopted without enquiry, and maintained without suspicion of any difficulty or doubt,) may not have prejudiced him against the opinion which I have just stated : an opinion, whether correct or incorrect, unquestionably advanced and taught by some of the greatest doctors in the Church.

If it be said that the Christian baptism was not instituted before the resurrection of our Lord, “for the Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified,” this would lead us to the conclusion that the baptisms administered by the disciples of Jesus, Who is said Himself to have baptized by the agency of others, were not essentially different from the baptism of John. But the chief of the distinctions between them is especially said to have been in this, that by the one the Holy Ghost was indeed given : “He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost,” was the prophetic declaration of S. John, who was then speaking of his own baptism, as being with water only, and pointing out its inferiority. And, as more than one writer has observed, it is scarcely to be supposed that our Blessed Lord would have merely adopted the rite conferred by John, or have instituted a new one, not superior, and itself also soon to be superseded. Moreover, the language of inspiration refers to a present, not to a future, sacrament. “Upon Whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on Him, the

Same is He Which baptizeth [ $\delta$  βαπτίζειν] with the Holy Ghost.”<sup>47</sup>

The very way also in which the fact is related, that “Jesus baptized,—though Jesus Himself baptized not, but His disciples,” is not to be overlooked. It lays down evidently a distinction between the two baptisms: were it otherwise, why should it not have been simply stated that the disciples of Jesus baptized? that is, had it been so, with no other than the baptism of John. But here it is asserted that *He* baptized, and yet, not He, but His disciples: in other words, they administered a baptism instituted by Himself; a baptism different from the Baptist’s; a baptism infinitely exceeding that which it succeeded and did away with, in that it conveyed the gift of the Holy Ghost.<sup>48</sup>

There is another text, which I would not omit to notice, though I would not insist upon it. Immediately after the evangelist S. Luke has told us of the baptism of our Lord, he adds, “And Jesus, being full of the Holy Ghost, returned from Jordan, and was led by the Spirit into the wilderness.” I say, this is not perhaps to be insisted on; yet are we bound to give to the statement its full weight, joined as it is with, and so very pointedly attached to the record of, the baptism of our Lord. That great event is, let me repeat, a most deep mystery; and when we find it

<sup>47</sup> S. John. *ch.* 1. *v.* 33.

*Homil.* 37. 48. *Opera. tom.* 5.

<sup>48</sup> Compare Venerable Bede. *p.* 275. 373.



thus written in connexion with it, "Jesus being full of the Holy Ghost," we must be careful not to misunderstand and explain it away, as having no bearing upon the question how far the ordinary gifts and graces of the Spirit were given to and withheld from the disciples of the Son of Man, before He was glorified.

More than all, the text *Jo.* vij. 39. upon which so many difficulties have been raised, has by great commentators been held to refer solely to the abundant graces and visible outpouring of the Spirit after the Ascension.<sup>49</sup> It is true that such were not bestowed on any of the disciples or apostles during our Lord's sojourn upon earth, but it does not follow that the baptism of Christ before His death was other than that appointed afterwards, and that the Holy Ghost which ever now accom-

<sup>49</sup> Thus Nicolas de Lyra, in the *Glossa ordinaria*. "Hæc sunt verba Evangelistæ exponentis verbum Christi prædictum de acceptione Spiritus Sancti in signo visibili, sicut acceperunt apostoli die Pentecostes, quia ex illa acceptione facta est redundantia fidei in prædicatione evangelii per totum orbem." Again, on the words, *Which they that believe on Him should receive*: "Quamvis enim apostoli haberent gratiam Spiritus Sancti ante diem Pentecostes, non tamen ita plene, et propter hoc non receperant in signo visibili, quod denotat gratiæ plenitudinem." So also, S. Chrysostom

cited in the margin. "Etsi prophetæ acceperunt eundem Spiritum; et Joannes et alii ante resurrectionem Christi; tamen erat alius modus donationis futurus apertior et plenior, etc."

To the same purpose Cornelius à Lapide. "*Accepturi* post mortem suam, merito ejusdem in Pentecoste. Licet enim ante illam apostoli, alique sancti recepissent Spiritum Sanctum, tamen non in illa fluviali copia et abundantia, quæ in illos effusa fuit in Pentecoste." *Comment. in Joan. cap.* vij. Also compare Hugo S. Charo, upon the same text.

panies and descends with the one, did not also in like manner accompany the administration of the other. Thus S. Augustine speaks: “ Quæritur utrum qui baptizati sunt illo tempore, quo scriptum est Dominum per discipulos suos baptizasse plures quam Johannes, acceperint Spiritum Sanctum. Alio enim loco Evangelii sic dicitur, *Spiritus enim non est datus, quia Jesus nondum erat clarificatus*.<sup>50</sup>——Spiritus Sanctus latenter dabatur ante Domini clarificationem: post manifestationem divinitatis ejus manifestius datus est. Et hoc dictum est, *Spiritus autem nondum erat datus*, id est, nondum sic apparuerat, ut omnes eum datum esse faterentur.”<sup>51</sup>

Nor, again, can it be determined from the often-quoted text in the gospel of S. Matthew, “ Go ye, teach all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” that the institution of the sacrament took place at that time; and was not, therefore, instituted previously. There is no doubt that then the command and the form to be observed for all ages were delivered, or rather, re-

---

<sup>50</sup> “ Et facillime quidem ita respondetur, quod Dominus Jesus, qui etiam mortuos suscitabat, poterat neminem illorum mori sinere, donec post ejus clarificationem, acciperent Spiritum Sanctum. Sed occurrit animo latro ille, cui dictum est, *Amen dico tibi, hodie mecum eris in paradiso*: qui nec ipsum baptismum acceperat.

Quanquam Cornelius, et qui cum eo ex gentibus crediderant, Spiritum Sanctum etiam prius quam baptizarentur acceperint: non tamen video quomodo et ille latro sine Spiritu Sancto dicere poterit, *Memento mei, Domine, dum veneris in regnum tuum*.” *ibid.*

<sup>51</sup> De divers. quæst. lxij. tom. vj. p. 38.

peated, to the apostles ; but, even if we had not other evidence of the fact of baptisms by the disciples, under the authority and in the Name of Christ, we could not reasonably have denied, upon the foundation of this text alone, that such had been administered.

Once more : although it is most true that the efficacy of the sacraments instituted by our Lord, and therefore the efficacy of baptism, rests upon and is to be referred for its cause to His sufferings and death, —to His Atonement acceptable and well-pleasing to the Father,—yet this need not, of necessity, be retrospective. There is in the sacraments a double perfection ; the one essential, the other accidental. The one, as being begun from the first hour of our Lord's life on earth, still depended, as to its accidental perfection, upon its consummation in His death. Likewise, there is in baptism a double signification ; the one effective, the other commemorative. Effective, whether before or after the Passion, in that equally it conveyed the regenerating grace,—the death unto sin, the new birth unto righteousness—: commemorative, when all was finished, of the sufferings, and burial, and resurrection of the Lord.

So was it also with respect to the ordinances under the old Law, and in the days of the patriarchs. Whatsoever grace they conferred, was entirely to be attributed to the Passion, no less clearly known to the Almighty before all ages, than after it had been, in time, exhibited in actual reality. The legal sacraments and sacrifices were, it is universally acknow-

ledged, inferior to those which we now enjoy under the gospel: if for no other cause, yet for this; that until the Atonement was complete, they could but have regard to that which was about to be, neither truly representing nor commemorating the great fact itself. Nor were the gates of Heaven open: these were to be closed until the price of our redemption had been paid. Whatsoever were the graces accompanying the divine ordinances from the beginning, those ordinances were effective, after the Fall, solely with respect to the future and foreseen Atonement to be made by Him, Who is "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world."

Hence we may well say with S. Augustine of the Redeemer, "*de latere ejus in cruce pendentis lancea percusso sacramenta ecclesiæ profluxerunt,*"<sup>52</sup> whilst we limit that assertion to the price then paid and the completed satisfaction; not extending it to signify that the sacraments were not instituted and of avail before the Passion. This is the truth as respects the eucharist, and we must not hastily refuse to allow it to the sacrament of baptism.

Although we conclude, therefore, that the sacrament of baptism was instituted by our Lord before His Passion, yet it does not follow that it was of necessity to be then observed and received.<sup>53</sup> The pub-

<sup>52</sup> In *Johan. tr. xv. cap. 4. tom. 3. p. 410.* Cf. *Rhabanus Maurus. adv. Judæos. cap. xxxij. Thes. Anecd. tom. 5. p. 472.*

<sup>53</sup> The necessity and the benefits of the old legal rite of circumcision were, of course, variously affected from the time of the first

lic promulgation of all positive laws is required before they become binding; and the law of baptism is clearly of that kind. The day of Pentecost has generally been regarded by most writers as the time when this publication of the necessity of baptism was made: and that, from that day to this and so long as the world lasts, all men, to whom the knowledge of the law has come, are bound to receive this sacrament as the only known means whereby they can be saved. Upon that day, after the descent of the Holy Ghost, we find the various particulars which we might beforehand have expected upon so solemn an occasion. The place, the city of Jerusalem; the time, towards noon; a multitude of people, "devout men, out of every nation under heaven;" the speaker, an apostle, nay, the first in place and dignity, S. Peter; his discourse, including the chief subjects of the Christian Faith,—the

---

institution, whether publicly made known or not, of the sacrament of baptism. Some have laid down four distinctions. First, that circumcision was necessary until the institution of baptism: secondly: useful, but not necessary, from its institution until the promulgation of it; neither of use, nor of necessity, after the promulgation; and unlawful, as regarded the Gentiles at least, after the council at Jerusalem. Scotus. *Sentent. lib. iv. dist. 3. quæst. iiij.* These distinctions have been much controverted: see, however, the com-

mentary, Opera, tom. 8. p. 204.

Peter Lombard decides; "Dicimus in Christi morte terminata esse legalia omnia. Ex tunc ergo circumcisio perdidit vim suam, ita quod postea non profecerit, sed potius obfuerit observatoribus suis. Sed usque ad oblationem veræ hostiæ potuit prodesse. Si enim ante passionem legalia finem habuissent, non ea imminente vetus pascha cum discipulis manducas-set." *Sent. lib. iv. dist. iiij. K.* Compare bishop Bull. *Harm. apost. cap. xiv. §. 2.*



Spirit, who should be poured out upon all flesh: the Son, Who as man, having dwelt among men, was delivered, and crucified, and raised up, and exalted to be Lord and Christ; the Father, by Whom all had been accomplished,—the command, “Repent, and be baptized every one of you;” and obedience to that command, “They that gladly received his word were baptized.”<sup>54</sup>

<sup>54</sup> Tourneley, *de bapt. p.* 267. supposes that before this time, the obligation to receive the baptism of Christ was binding upon those to whom our Lord had explained the need of it; as, for example, to Nicodemus. S. Bernard’s epistle, (the 77th) or rather treatise on baptism, addressed to Hugo S. Victor, is appealed to by almost all who have discussed this question. His opinion is decided that, at what time soever the sacrament was instituted, it was not of necessity to salvation, before the public promulgation of it. “Valde injuste exigitur obeditio, ubi non præcessit auditio.—Quod ergo omnino fieri non poterat si non audiretur, quo pacto quæso exigi debeat et antequam audiretur?—Ex eo tempore tantum cuique cœpit antiqua observatio non valere, et non baptizatus quisque novi præcepti reus existere, ex quo præceptum ipsum inexcusabiliter ad ejus potuit pervenire no-

titiam.” *Opera. tom. 1. p.* 631. 634.

See also Bellarmin. *de bapt. cap. v.*

Aquinas also concludes:

“Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod etiam ante passionem Christi baptismus habebat efficaciam a Christi passione, inquantum eam præfigurabat: aliter tamen quam sacramenta veteris legis: nam illa erant figuræ tantum, baptismus autem ab ipso Christo virtutem habebat justificandi, per cujus virtutem ipsa etiam passio salutifera fuit.—¶ Ad tertium dicendum, quod sacramenta non sunt obligatoria, nisi quando sub præcepto ponuntur: quod quidem non fuit ante passionem. Quod enim Dominus ante passionem Nicodemo dixit, *Nisi quis renatus*, etc. magis videtur ad futurum respicere, quam ad præsens tempus.” *Summa, pars, III. quæst. lxxvj. art. 2.*

## CHAPTER XII.



WE have now considered at some length the following particulars, relating to the sacrament of Holy Baptism : namely, the definition and meaning of the term, baptism ;—the matter of the sacrament ;—the form ;—the minister, whether proper or improper, whether regular or irregular ; and the further question of the recognition of lay-baptism, now, in the church of England ;—the necessity of the reception of this sacrament ;—the time of the institution of it ;—and the distinction between the baptisms of John and of our Blessed Lord.

These, however, are but very few of the numerous circumstances and particulars which a dissertation, aiming at anything like completeness, upon this great subject, would necessarily embrace. Such, for example, as these ; all worthy of the diligent inquiry of the theological student. The early and later rites and ceremonies in conferring and receiving baptism ;—the examinations which preceded it, and the qualifications which were required of all the candidates ;—the appointed seasons and places at which the solemn administrations took place ;—the careful and repeated preparation of catechumens ;—the ancient and general use of unction, and of exorcism, and of the sign of the

cross ;—the previous fasting, and confession, and profession of faith ;—the vestments which were worn, after the wearing of any had been introduced ;—the origin, and object, and antiquity of sponsors ;—their duty, and, by the old canon-law, their relation to those for whom they had undertaken the office ;—the proper subject who might claim and receive the sacrament, including especially the question of infant-baptism ;—the case of hypothetical administration ;—and, to name no more, the blessings and the privileges which baptism conveys.

But upon none of these points do I now propose to speak, except briefly upon the three last. Because they may all be found fully discussed in many books, easily to be procured, and commonly well known to the English clergy. Such as Bingham's *Christian antiquities*, or Dr. Wall's *history of infant-baptism*, or the works of Wheatley and others on the ritual, or the treatises of archbishop Lawrence, and bishop Bethell. Nor shall I do more, as regards administration hypothetically, and the subject of baptism, and the blessings which the sacrament conveys, than attempt to supply some facts, and suggest some considerations, which seem to have been omitted in the books which I have just named.

First, hypothetical baptism. The rubric of our present ritual which allows or, rather, orders this, is as follows. “¶ *But if they which bring the infant to the church do make such uncertain answers to the priest's questions, as that it cannot appear that the child was*

*baptized with water, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, (which are essential parts of baptism,) then let the priest baptize it in the form before appointed for public baptism of infants; saving that at the dipping of the child in the font, he shall use this form of words. If thou art not already baptized, N. I baptize thee in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen."*

Nothing can be more precise than this direction, nor more agreeable to the ancient practice of the English church. With some variations, quite unimportant as to the question immediately before us, it is to be traced through the Books of Elizabeth, and Edward the VIth, up to the earlier Manuals. It stands thus, according to the old Use of Sarum.

*"Si vero dubitet rationabiliter sacerdos utrum infans ad baptizandum sibi oblatus prius in forma debita fuerit baptizatus vel non, debet omnia perficere cum eo sicut cum alio quem constat sibi non baptizatum, præterquam quod verba sacramentalia essentialia proferre debeat sub conditione, hoc modo dicendo: N. si baptizatus es, ego non rebaptizo te: sed si nondum baptizatus es, ego baptizo te, in Nomine etc. Sub aspersione vel immersione ut supra."*<sup>1</sup>

This rubric is confirmed by a statute of archbishop Peckham, upon which Lyndwood glosses. "*Rationabiliter dubitet. Si enim constiterit aliquem esse baptizatum per hominem habentem ad hoc potestatem,*

---

<sup>1</sup> Monumenta Ritualia. vol. 1. p. 28.

utputa, per presbyterum extra casum necessitatis, vel in casu necessitatis per quemcunque alium habentem intentionem baptizandi, et servantem formam ecclesiæ, talis non debet iterum baptizari. Iste tamen textus loquitur in casu dubii, ubi notatur, quod dubium potest esse sive ratione facti, sive ratione juris. Ratione facti patet exemplum, quando aliquis natus est in captivitate Saracenorum: nam si quis natus est de parentibus fidelibus, et inter fideles nutritus, præsumitur baptizatus. De jure autem potest esse dubium, ut quia dubitatur, an fuerit forma servata an non. Potest etiam esse dubium de facto, si infans recenter natus expositus fuerit, et in eo vel circa eum non appareant signa baptismi. *Si nondum.* Ex hac litera videtur, quod aliquis baptizari potest sub conditione. Sed contra hoc opponitur *de Reg. jur.* Solutio. Dic, quod quædam est conditio de præterito, vel de præsentī, et ista non est proprie conditio, nec suspendit actum: et talis est illa, de qua hic fit mentio. Alia est conditio de futuro, et talis non potest adjici in baptismo, utputa, *Baptizo te si iveris Romam, vel, si feceris talem eleemosynam.* Ecclesiæ namque sacramenta sunt pure et simpliciter conferenda.”<sup>2</sup>

The “signs of baptism” in exposed infants are somewhat explained by a canon of a council at York, in 1195. Whence it appears, that salt was placed occasionally by the side of the infant, as a token that the sacrament had been administered. But the canon

---

<sup>2</sup> *Lib. III. tit. 24.* Circa sacramentum.



forbids any reliance upon such an uncertain testimony: nor without a sufficient reason. “Ubi autem puer, cujus baptisma ignoratur, reperitur expositus, sive cum sale sive sine sale reperiatur, baptizetur; cum non intelligatur iteratum, quod nescitur fuisse collatum.”<sup>3</sup>

There is a long chapter in the *Pupilla oculi*, on the manner of baptizing in cases of doubt, and on the

<sup>3</sup> Wilkins. Conc. tom. 1. p. 501.

Another mode of attesting the previous baptism of exposed infants, was by placing a written paper near them, declaring the fact. This seems still to be a practice abroad; and late decisions of diocesan and other synods have ordered, that such schedules, alone, should not be allowed to be decisive; at least, so far as to prevent administration of the sacrament *sub conditione*. “Testibus, non testimoniis, sit credendum,” was the old and wise rule of the civil law; in *l. testium*. 3. ff. *de testibus*. Cf. Benedict. xiv. Opera. tom. xij. p. 255.

Compare with the canons already cited, the 41st excerpt of archbishop Egbert; the 3d canon of the council of London, in 1200; the 23rd of the council at Durham, in 1220; the 1st of the council at Oxford, in 1222; and, not to mention others, the 2nd of the synod of Exeter, in 1287. Wilkins. Concilia. tom. 1. p. 104. 505. 576. 594. tom. 2. p. 131.

This form of hypothetical baptism and of administering the sacrament at all, in cases where evidence of previous reception could not be shown, or of infants deserted by their parents, was a ground of objection taken by the puritans. See Whitgift, *Defence etc.* p. 621. Survey of Book of C. Prayer. 1606. p. 112. It does not appear to have been excepted against in 1661.

I would remind the reader of the place in the Octavius of Minucius Felix, where he brings this charge against the heathens. “Vos enim video procreatos filios nunc feris et avibus exponere, nunc adstrangulatos misero mortis genere elidere.” He is refuting the scandalous accusation which was so frequently laid against the Christians that their disciples were initiated with the slaughter or blood of an infant. Edit. Ouzel. 1672. p. 289. Cf. p. 306. And see the very learned notes of Ermenhors-tius, Rigalt, and others.

varieties of cases which might occur. It concludes, with Lyndwood above, that the children of believing parents, in a Christian country, are to be presumed baptized, unless there is evidence to the contrary. This is a rule not to be lightly disregarded at any time; neither is it without some bearing upon the re-baptization lately introduced by the clergy of the church of Rome in this kingdom, upon which I have already remarked.<sup>4</sup> Let it then be remembered that the ancient and wise practice was, in all such cases (I repeat it, of children of believing parents in a Christian country) to require proof that baptism had *not* been conferred, and not proof that it had been, before the hypothetical form could rightly be resorted to. Nay, more than this; whilst, if the baptism of such a person was objected against, it was sufficient to bring one witness only to prove it, two at least were required to establish the contrary, namely, that he had not been baptized.

The Pupilla further advises that if any one should baptize a female supposing it to be a male child; or one of two, supposing it to be the other; the administration is to be considered valid: nevertheless, the author submits this to the judgment of other canonists, and allows the hypothetical form to be used, if his opinion is not held to be correct. The doctrine of intention was mixed up with, and increased the difficulty of such cases. Also, another condition is specified as

---

<sup>4</sup> Above, p. 82.

invalidating the sacrament, different from those suggested by Lyndwood: as; if a person should, in extremity, baptize the child of a Jew, in this form: "I baptize thee, *etc.* if thy father should consent to-morrow:" and the child dies: such a baptism is to be regarded as invalid, because the condition annexed is repugnant to the true signification of the sacramental form. "*Alii dicunt,*" it continues, "*quod ideo puer non est baptizatus; quia licet pater pueri post modum consentiat, tamen pro mensura consensus sui puer non est capax sacramenti; cum non sit de foro ecclesiæ militantis.*" Again, if there is a doubt as to the baptism of a person living, he is to be hypothetically baptized: but as to a person dead, his baptism is to be recognized, except there be clear evidence to the contrary, and he is to be prayed for as a member of the church of Christ. Other varieties of doubtful cases I pass over, but if the student may, he will do well to read the whole chapter. Not only do such investigations bear upon and elucidate many other intricate questions in theology, more particularly those which are concerned in the doctrine of the sacraments, but they have an especial interest, when applied to the sacrament of baptism. If they seem to descend into minute details, some of which neither have, nor reasonably can be expected to have, any place in actual experience,<sup>5</sup> yet it is to be remembered that the ge-

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, this:

"Item posito, quod duo sacer-

dotes uterque cæcus et surdus

simul et semel baptizent unum

neral rule is only to be arrived at by a careful discussion of every possible difficulty which might be presumed to occur even to a single individual.<sup>6</sup>

It has been said that this hypothetical or conditional form was invented and introduced by the schoolmen. But, as Martene has shewn,<sup>7</sup> this is an erroneous and false assertion. We know how much the Catholic Church, in all ages, has abhorred the iteration of the sacrament of baptism: and yet, there are many decrees of councils, reaching up to the primitive ages, directing the immediate administration of it, in cases where a previous reception was, from any cause, reasonably doubtful. Thus, on the one hand, we have the 47th of the apostolical canons, enjoining deposition as the penalty upon any priest or bishop, who should dare to rebaptize; and in the fourth century, reordinations and rebaptizations are mentioned together: “non liceat fieri rebaptizationes et reordinationes.”<sup>8</sup> Indeed, this is a point concerning which there can be no dispute.

puerum neutro credente alterum baptizare, et utroque dicente sub hac forma; ‘ego baptizo te, si nullus alius te baptizet,’ puer non est baptizatus: quia conditio adjecta est corruptiva significationis formæ sacramentalis.”

<sup>6</sup> See the *Pupilla oculi. pars. II. cap. vj.* Compare Hostiensis. *Summa. pars. III. rubr. xlij.*

<sup>7</sup> De ant. ecc. rit. *tom. I. cap. I. xvj. 10.* “Nonnulli viri eruditi existimant hujusmodi condi-

tionatas formas a scholasticis theologis adinventas fuisse; verum toto aberrant cælo. Nam longe ante scholasticos, certe ante annos octingentos conditionata adhibebatur formula, id quod evincunt Isaaci Lingoniensis episcopi canones;—et etiam antea S. Bonifacius Mogunt. archiepisc. in statutis, decreverat, etc.”

<sup>8</sup> Mansi. *Concil. tom. 3. p. 885. Can. xxxvij. Concil. Carthag. III.*

Yet, on the other hand, we have as plain and often-repeated injunctions and decisions of the Church, that where a doubt exists as to the reception of this sacrament by any one, it should be administered. About the end of the fourth century, the 5th Carthaginian council decreed, and the constitution is inserted into the body of the canon-law: "Placuit de infantibus, quoties non inveniuntur certissimi testes, qui eos baptizatos esse sine dubitatione testentur, neque ipsi sunt per ætatem idonei de traditis sibi sacramentis respondere, absque ullo scrupulo eos esse baptizandos."<sup>9</sup> This was confirmed by two later African synods; one, shortly after; namely in the years 401, and 505. The Decretum, immediately after the Carthaginian canon, just cited, gives a rescript of S. Leo to the bishop of Ravenna, in which he decides that any person who is not certain of his baptism, nor can obtain evidence of it, may be baptized.

The argument which arises from these considerations is, that it is utterly improbable that the Catholic Church, holding the true doctrine of "one baptism," should have been unmindful of some such qualification

---

<sup>9</sup> De consecr. *dist. iv. cap. exj.* Mansi. *Concil. tom. 3. p. 969.* The witnesses mentioned by this canon, were required under a different state of things from that which took place in later ages. At that time, in the midst of a heathen population, the presump-

tion would naturally be against the fact of a previous reception, just as in a Christian country, the presumption would be otherwise. The phrase also, "absque ullo scrupulo" is explained by the statute of S. Boniface, presently cited in the text.



or condition, as, "If thou art not already baptized," or of some such protest as, "I intend not to rebaptize," which was to be declared by her ministers in all such cases of doubt. Indeed it is remarkable that S. Leo, in the rescript in which he so expressly enjoins the conferring of the sacrament, notices no less plainly the apostolical sentence, "One Lord, one faith, one baptism."<sup>10</sup> It is true, that no earlier record of a hypothetical form than the eighth century, has yet been produced; but the observance of it must have been tacitly understood, even though not directly enforced by canons. When we do first find it ordered, it is not spoken of as a new regulation, but, rather, as a continuance of an ancient rule. Thus, in the statutes

<sup>10</sup> On account of other important particulars, I would extract this rescript.

"Cum itaque baptismi sui nihil recordetur, qui regenerationis est cupidus, nec alter attestari de eo possit, qui sciat consecratum, nec ille, qui consecratur. Scimus quidem inexpiabile esse facinus, quoties juxta hæreticorum damnata à sanctis patribus instituta cogitur aliquis lavacrum, quod regenerandis semel tributum est, bis subire, apostolica reclamante sententia: quæ nobis unam prædicat in Trinitate Deitatem, unam in fide confessionem, unum in baptismo sacramentum. Sed in hoc nihil simile formidatur: quoniam non

potest in iterationis crimen venire, quod omnino factum esse nescitur. Atque ideo, quoties persona talis inciderit, sollicita primum examinatione discutite, et longo tempore (nisi forte supremus finis immineat) indagate, utrum nemo penitus sit, qui testimonio suo juvare possit ignorantiam nescientis: et cum constiterit hunc, qui baptismatis indiget sacramento, sola inaniter suspicione prohiberi; accedat intrepidus ad consequendam gratiam, cujus in se nullum scit esse vestigium: nec vereamur huic salutis januam aperire, quam nunquam ante docetur ingressus." *De consecr. dist. iv. cap. cxij.*

of Boniface, archbishop of Mentz, about the year 745, it is stated: "Si de aliquibus dubium sit, utrum sint baptizati, absque ullo scrupulo baptizentur; his tamen verbis præmissis: Non te rebaptizo, sed si nondum es baptizatus, *etc.*"<sup>11</sup>

It is not often that the English clergy are called upon to use this conditional form; and this is owing to one or two circumstances. It is, in the first place, unusual for lay-members of our Church, even in cases of urgent necessity, to administer the sacrament of baptism; and, secondly, if the previous question appointed in our ritual, "By whom was this child baptized?" be answered by the giving of some known name, the two last questions, upon which, in reality, the doubts and difficulties would occur, are not often either put to those who bring the child; or, if put, pressed to some determinate answers. Those cases, also, are infrequent, in which children who have been baptized by dissenting and schismatic teachers, are brought to the church, to be there publicly received "into the congregation of Christ's flock," and to obtain the recognition of the validity and completeness of the sacrament which it is asserted has been given to them. These again, however, are especially the instances, in which as regards both the matter and the form, variations and deficiencies and carelessness in the administration are very likely to have happened.

I must not omit to add that the hypothetical form

---

<sup>11</sup> *Spicilegium. tom. 9. cit. Martene. ut supra.*

ought not to be resorted to, as a mere means of escape from troublesome enquiries, and as a settling of difficulties or doubts which might be suggested. Were it so, the serious error of rebaptization would not seldom be the consequence ; and, in short, it never should be used, except after all diligent pains taken to arrive at the truth, whether the person has, or has not, really been baptized already. To do otherwise, in haste or idleness, might on the one hand cast contempt upon a valid administration, not difficult of proof perhaps ; or on the other might seem to give some feature of goodness to that, which must at once appear to all, except to very ignorant clergy, null and without effect. There are known rules, which will generally enable parish-priests to arrive at a sufficiently sound decision, as to whether there was a due observance of “the essential parts of baptism ;” and it is only when, first, an assertion is made that the child has been baptized, and yet, secondly, no *certain* information can be obtained as to the use of the proper matter and the proper form, that the administration of the sacrament of baptism, *sub conditione*, is justifiable and required.

The permission, or rather the direction, by the Church to use this form at all, is owing to her firm conviction of the truth of two doctrines ; the great necessity of baptism where it may be had, and the impiety of repeating it. By the adoption, therefore, of this condition, “If thou art not already baptized,” we are enabled to satisfy every just and reasonable scruple existing either in ourselves or in others, and

nevertheless avoid any approach towards irreverence. Upon the first of these doctrines, the necessity of baptism, I have already spoken ; and a few words may be added here upon the impiety of repeating it.

There are at least two texts in the epistles of S. Paul which may be referred to in proof of this sacrament being to be administered once, and once only. In the fourth chapter to the Ephesians it is written : “ There is one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling ; one Lord, one faith, one baptism.” Again, in the epistle to the Hebrews, a passage which cannot be explained except with regard to that sacrament by which alone are conveyed regeneration and renewal and partaking of the Holy Ghost : “ It is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance.”

Fully agreeable to this doctrine is the constant teaching of the Catholic Church : as summed up and represented by S. Augustine, where he declares, “ Quid sit perniciosius, utrum omnino non baptizari, an rebaptizari, judicare difficile est.”<sup>12</sup> Again : “ Re-

---

<sup>12</sup> *Contra Donatist. Opera.* 2. cap. ij. S. Jerome. *contra Jotom.* 9. p. 107. Cf. *Tr.* 57. in *vinian. lib.* 2. *Joan.* S. Ambrose. *de pœnit. lib.*

generatio spiritualis una est, sicut generatio carnalis una est.”<sup>13</sup>

More particularly I must adduce some evidence from the records of the church of England. The reader should refer to the statutes (so-called) of S. Patrick, in the fifth century, in which rebaptization is prohibited: and to the excerpts of archbishop Egbert.<sup>14</sup> Venerable Bede has said, in his homily on the 3rd ch. of S. John; “Sive enim hæreticus, sive schismaticus, sive facinorosus quisque in confessione Sanctæ Trinitatis baptizet, non valet ille, qui ita baptizatus est, a bonis catholicis rebaptizari, ne confessio vel invocatio tanti Nominis videatur annullari.” And again in his commentary upon the 8th ch. of Genesis, discoursing of the flood: “Eunt ergo aquæ, quæ arcam diluerant, et decrescunt usque ad decimum mensem, quia lavacrum baptismatis, ubi in singulis quibusque fidelium suum munus impleverit, cessat. Neque enim quisquam, si peccaverit, potest denuo eodem sacri baptismatis fonte mundari; sed eos jam semel ablutos ac sanctificatos ad spem mittit vitæ cœlestis.”<sup>15</sup> Not much later, archbishop Ælfric, in his homily of the catholic faith: “Let every one know also, that no man may be twice baptized; (þæt nan man ne mot boen tuwa gefullod;) but if a man err after his baptism, we

---

<sup>13</sup> Tr. xij. in Joan. cf. tr. xj.  
 “Recte intellexit Nicodemus, etc.  
 —Quomodo uterus non potest re-  
 peti, sic nec baptismus.”

<sup>14</sup> Wilkins. *Concilia. tom. 1.*  
*p. 5. 101.*

<sup>15</sup> Opera. tom. v. *p. 110. tom.*  
*vij. p. 112.*



believe that he may be saved, if with weeping he repent of his sins.”<sup>16</sup>

I pass over, for a moment, the intervening centuries, during which the same doctrine was insisted on, without any qualifications,<sup>17</sup> by the repeated councils of the English church, in order that I might place here the judgments of two of our greatest divines in more modern days; namely, archbishop Whitgift, and his contemporary, Hooker. The first has declared; “there is but one baptisme, wherewith it is sufficient once to be christened, seeing that baptisme once receyued doth endure for euer, as a perpetuall signe of our adoption.”<sup>18</sup> And the other; “Iteration of baptism once given hath been always thought a manifest contempt of that ancient apostolic aphorism, ‘One Lord, one faith, one baptism.’”<sup>19</sup> These decisions might

<sup>16</sup> Homilies, *vol.* 1. *p.* 293. Again: “Let not a man baptized in the Name of the Holy Trinity, be afterward a second time baptized, that the invocation of the Holy Ghost be not contemned.” Hom. on the Epiphany, *vol.* 2. *p.* 49.

<sup>17</sup> I must not, however, omit the assertion in the articles of 1536; “*Item*, that children or men once baptized, can, ne ought ever to be baptized again.” Repeated, almost word for word, both in the *Institution* and *Necessary Doctrine*. Formularies, *etc.* *p.* xix. 93. 255. Compare also the

following from a draught of some articles, among archbishop Cranmer’s papers in the State Paper Office: which is important, as possibly it may have furnished materials for the Articles of Edw. VI. “Dicimus—quod non debeat iterari baptismus, et quod infantes debeant baptizari.” *Works*, *vol.* 4. *p.* 280. See the editor’s note, *p.* 273.

<sup>18</sup> Defense of the answer, *p.* 622.

<sup>19</sup> Eccl. Polity. *Book* 5. *ch.* lxij. §. 4. Compare §. 12.

I would desire to add the following from the works of Melanc-

easily be multiplied from the works of succeeding writers in our Church, all speaking in one and the same language; but as it seemed well to quote the above, as evidence of their own age, a most important one, so also is it quite unnecessary to heap up further authorities in their support.

Returning to the canons of the church of England in the middle ages, I shall also content myself with extracting one, a provincial constitution of archbishop Peckham, upon which Lyndwood's gloss enters into various details, worth the consideration of the student. "Si forte contingat pueros propter mortis periculum a laicis baptizari, caveant sacerdotes ne baptismum legitime factum audeant iterare."

That part of the gloss which bears upon the question now before us, is in explanation of the last word of this constitution. "*Iterare*. Semel enim baptizatus non debet rebaptizari. Quod si fiat, rebaptizans graviter punietur;—Secundum canones, si talis clericus sit, deponi debet. Laicus vero excommunicari debet, et nec talis poterit ordinari, nisi dispensatione præhabita. Et hoc verum, si factum sit publicum; secus

---

thon: "Peccatum est, abuti nomine Dei, et invocationem veram improbare: qui autem rebaptizant, improbant priorem baptismum, indicant inanem et inutilem fuisse. Atque ita improbant veram invocationem Dei, factam de hoc baptizato." *Loci. de bapt. Opera. tom. 1. p. 236. Cf. tom. 3. p. 39.*

For the doctrine of the schools, see the Summa of Aquinas: *Pars III. quæst. lxxvj. art. 9.* Duns Scotus, *Reportat. Paris. lib. IV. dist. 4. quæst. vij.* See also the annotations of Beverege on the Nicene canons. *App. Pandect. tom. 2. p. 86.*

si sit occultum : tunc peracta pœnitentia potest promoveri sine dispensatione. Et sciendum, quod ubi scienter fit iteratio baptismi prius legitime facti, tam rebaptizans quam rebaptizatus efficitur irregularis. Si vero non constat utrique sed alteri tantum, tunc sciens puni-  
tur, ignorans vero probabiliter excusari debet. Sed si ejus ignorantia fuit crassa et supina, debet puniri arbitrarie.—Sed tunc quæro quare baptismus legitime factus non debet reiterari? dic quod sex possunt assignari causæ. Una est, quia character, qui imprimitur, indelebilis est, sicut in confirmatione et in ordine, et cum quadam consecratione datur : et ideo sicut aliæ consecrationes non reiterantur in ecclesia ; sic nec baptismus. Secunda causa est, quia originale peccatum, contra quod principaliter datur, non iteratur. Tertia est, quia baptismus morti Christi assimilatur : Christus autem semel tantum mortuus est, et ideo nec baptismus debet iterari. Quarta est, quia per baptismum fit universalis purgatio peccatorum. Unde si iterari posset, daretur hominibus incentivum peccandi. Quinta ratio est, quia baptismus est quædam spiritualis generatio. Unde sicut generatio in utero non potest reiterari, sic nec baptismus. Sexta est, quia baptizatus per baptismum acquiritur Deo ; et transit in dominium ejus. Unde si iterum baptizaretur, sequeretur nova et iterata ac multiplicata acquisitio dominii, quod esse non potest : quia quod semel meum est, amplius ex eadem causa meum fieri non potest.”<sup>20</sup>

<sup>20</sup> *Lib. 1. tit. 7.* Quod in constitutione. To the same purpose,

though I think it unnecessary to extract from them, are the Pupilla,

The first four of the above reasons are taken from the third part of the Summa of Aquinas: in which place also some arguments are advanced, to shew that this sacrament might be repeated. These are, that the disciples of the Baptist were rebaptized: that the Paulianists and other heretics were, by the Nicene fathers, ordered to be baptized: that baptism is necessary to salvation, and yet we must sometimes doubt as to the reception of it in occasional instances: and that as the eucharist, which is the great sacrament of the Gospel, may be reiterated, so, much more, may the sacrament of baptism. The reader will at once see that these arguments are not of any weight, and three of them have been already discussed; although not with reference to this point of the iteration of baptism, as indeed they can scarcely be said to bear on it at all.

There might at first sight appear to be more in another argument, also suggested, that as sins are frequently repeated during man's life, so also ought baptism to be, which is acknowledged to be the chief means by which they are washed away. But sins after baptism do not deprive the sacrament of its grace once given: they impede and hinder its efficacy, which may be again restored by earnest repentance and by abso-

---

*pars. ii. cap. ij. E. Manipulus  
curatorum, fol. xiv. b.*

Scotus, who is followed by Gabriel Biel, rejects all these reasons: resting the fact that this sacrament

must not be iterated, simply upon the Divine Will: though he allows the force of other arguments, by way of support. *Sentent. lib. iv. dist. 6. qu. vij.*

lution. Were it indeed otherwise, it would not prove that baptism might be again received; but it would rather lead us into the old heresy, that every deadly sin willingly committed after baptism is sin against the Holy Ghost, and unpardonable.<sup>21</sup>

As to the reasons which are urged from the repetition of the Holy Eucharist, it is, in one sense, conclusive, that that sacrament was particularly appointed by our Blessed Lord to be repeated again and again: "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it—as often as ye eat

---

<sup>21</sup> "Objiciunt aliqui, si baptismus sigillum sit fœderis initi, saltem rebaptizari eos debere, qui, peccatis conscientiam vastantibus, Christo, et ejus fœderi renunciârunt. Sed sponte hæc corruunt, si attendamus naturam fœderis, quod in baptismo obsignatur. Nam uti olim in circumcisione, ita nunc in baptismo, Deus quidem promittit gratiam, et vitam æternam; homo autem fidem, et obedientiam, pollicetur. Quod si a pacto resiliat homo, amittit ille quidem jus postulandi vitam æternam; at, qui semper pacto stat, Deus, non perdit jus suum in hominem. *etc.*" Vossius, *de bapt. disp.* 17. xxij. I may remark that this author entirely adopts the reason which, as stated in the note above, Scotus and Biel insist on. He continues in the next section: "Scrupulum etiam injicere de istis conantur, qui, fidem simulantes, baptismum

perceperint.—Sed hic etiam in considerationem venit, quod defectus fuerit ex parte hominis, non Dei; qui nulli baptizato, non ponenti obicem per peccatum, gratiam negat salutarem. Quare de his ita statuimus; ubi, posita hypocrisi, credere incipiunt, priorem baptismum, qui antea inanis erat cæremonia, atque ideo profanatio sacramenti, fieri sigillum ejus fœderis, quod Deus init cum credentibus."

I am far from disputing the general correctness of these arguments: but the reader will at once perceive how inadequate they are; they are instructive as tokens of the line pursued by writers of the school represented by Vossius; which, debasing the sacrament of baptism, yet is forced to confess, and to account for, the fact that it must never be iterated.



this bread, etc.” But let us take the answer of Aquinas, which is addressed more against the argument drawn from the analogy of the one sacrament to the other. “Dicendum, quod utrumque sacramentum, scilicet baptismi, et eucharistiæ, est repræsentativum dominicæ mortis, et passionis, aliter tamen, et aliter. Nam in baptismo commemoratur mors Christi, inquantum homo Christo commoritur, et in novam vitam regeneratur: sed in sacramento eucharistiæ commemoratur mors Christi, inquantum ipse Christus passus exhibetur nobis, quasi paschale convivium, secundum illud primæ Corinth. quinto, *Pascha nostrum immolatus est Christus, itaque epulemur*. Et quia homo semel nascitur, multoties autem cibatur, semel tantum datur baptismus, multoties autem eucharistia.”<sup>22</sup>

The second of the three particulars which I pro-

<sup>22</sup> Pars. III. *quæst.* lxxj. *art.* 9.

The following is the canon of the council of Trent directed to this point: “Si quis dixerit, vere et rite collatum baptismum iterandum esse illi, qui apud infideles fidem Christi negaverit, cum ad pœnitentiam convertitur, anathema sit.” *Sess.* VII. *can.* xj. Chemnitz consents to this; asserting truly, that no one is to be rebaptized after lapse, or even after apostasy and avowed denial of the faith. *Examen. concil. pars.* II. p. 51. For the office anciently used in the church of England in reconciliation of apostates, see

Monum. Ritualia. *vol.* 1. p. 229. Chemnitz mentions that Marcion advocated a repetition of baptism after sin: and there were other heretics, who argued that because we cannot but sin every day, so we ought also daily to be baptized. These were called *ἡμεροβαπτισταί*. It is said by Osorius, that the Ethiopians baptize themselves, annually, on the feast of the Epiphany: this, however, seems to be rather as in memory of their true and original baptism, than under any notion of repeating it. *De rebus Eman. lib.* 3.

pose to consider, is (to use the scholastic phrase) the *subject* of the sacrament of baptism. Without entering into details,—which we can seldom, if ever, be called upon to decide about, or into questions which were formerly much debated by various writers, but which now appear to be set at rest, (such as, for example, the lawfulness of baptizing the dead,) or, again, the much disputed doctrine of infant-baptism,—I would merely remind the reader that by the common consent, and universal practice of the Catholic Church, from the earliest ages down to the present time, all living men, and men only,<sup>23</sup> whether male or female, so soon as they are born into the world, and consenting either by themselves or by their representatives, are the proper subjects of this holy sacrament. That is, they, and they alone of all God's creatures, are entitled to claim, and capable of receiving, the privileges and blessings of baptism, which was expressly instituted by the Divine Redeemer, Jesus Christ, as the means by which they, being born in sin and the children of wrath, might be made members of Himself, the Head; children of God; and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven.<sup>24</sup>

But there is yet one point on which I would offer

---

<sup>23</sup> “Hæc enim dictio est indefinita unde omnes comprehendit, et non solum masculum, sed etiam feminam comprehendit;—nam et feminæ tenentur scire articulos fidei, sicut et masculi; et sic sub

dictione generis masculini continentur et feminæ.” Lyndwood. *lib. 1. tit. 1.* Ignorantia sacerdotum. *verb.* ne quis.

<sup>24</sup> “Quis enim inanimis, et sensus expertibus baptismum con-

some observations connected with this particular. It is; whether we are justified in conferring the sacrament of baptism upon children, either of unbelievers or of believers, against the will of the parents? Every parish-priest must know that this is a practical difficulty which may occur at any time to himself; and if so, he should be prepared beforehand with some opinion as to the course which he ought to adopt, founded upon the authorities and decisions of those who have investigated the matter.

Such instances moreover may have fallen within the experience of many of us; and I remember a case which happened not long ago in a neighbouring diocese, in which the priest baptized a child, in opposition to the declared wishes of the parents. He took water, and he said the form; (I mention this simply by way of an example :) the time it occupied was very short; nor was it easy, perhaps not possible, to pre-

---

ferat, cum baptismus ideo a Christo sit institutus, ut per eum in ecclesiam introducatur, et nobis copiosa conferatur gratia? an stipites, et res inanimæ introduci in ecclesiam possunt, et gratiæ munere potiri, atque uti? An vero angelis baptismum conferes, perinde quasi in ecclesiam introduci angeli possint, et per instrumenta sensibilia iis conferri gratia, qui nec gratia ditari egent, nec sensibus subsunt, nec sensibilibus ad-

juvantur? an belluis conferes? Quasi hæ supernaturalibus donis ornari possent, et ad eas ad supernaturalem statum evehendas, humanam carnem sumpserit Christus, *Qui propter nos homines, et propter nostram salutem descendit de cælis?* Trombelli, *de bapt.* tom. 3. p. 2. Compare also the exposition of venerable Bede on the 16th ch. of S. Mark. *Opera.* tom. x. p. 260.

vent the doing of it. He knew that, unbaptized, the child was obnoxious to the wrath of God ; he knew that “ children, which are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved ; ” he had no doubt that the child was at the point of death ; he could not but recollect that he had, ministerially, the power,—and if the power the privilege, and if the privilege (he thought) the duty,—of reconciling the dying infant to its offended Maker, and of washing away its guilt in the healing waters of baptism. Was he then justified in the act which he performed ?

The difficulties which are involved in this question are neither to be concealed nor denied. But we shall arrive, more easily, at some reasonable determination about it, if we follow the usual method of distinguishing the children of unwilling parents ; infants, upon the one hand, who are incapable of desiring baptism for themselves, and are ignorant both of the necessity of it and the blessings which it conveys ; and those, upon the other hand, who have arrived at years of discretion, and know both the excellence of baptism, and the responsibilities which lie upon all who claim and receive it. Cases of either of these two classes are not unlikely to be brought before the clergy of this country from time to time : they must be of frequent occurrence in our colonies, amongst a half-converted population ; and especially in those lands where the branches of our Church take almost entirely a missionary character.

With regard to the first of these two classes, it must

at once be evident that the difficulty resolves itself into a question of *age*. For there must be a time, even according to the civil law, when children are to be held able to decide for themselves, responsible for their own actions, and free from dependence upon and unlimited submission to their parents. Being then, as I have said, a question of age, it must always remain to be determined in each instance, as it happens, according to the various abilities, opportunities of learning, firmness of character, purity of morals, and other the like qualifications, as to the fitness of the candidate. If he is fit, then he ought to be baptized, even though his parents may be unwilling, and may still lawfully have, in worldly matters, authority over him.

The person by whom this is to be determined seems to be, in our Church at present, the bishop of the diocese. Whether the age be as low as eight and ten years, or upwards, still such candidates must be reckoned as adults, “of riper years,” able to answer for themselves. And the first rubric of the office appointed in our ritual on an occasion of this kind, is: “When any such persons, as are of riper years, are to be baptized, timely notice shall be given to the bishop, or whom he shall appoint for that purpose, a week before at the least, by the parents, or some other discreet persons: that so due care may be taken for their examination, *etc.*”

It has been said, and I must allow it, that the parish-priest is not by this rubric bound himself to give notice to the bishop: and therefore, if he is satisfied of the



merits and fitness of the candidate, he may determine, upon his own judgment, to administer baptism. The notice is to be given "by the parents, or some other discreet person:" the priest is not desired even to inquire whether this has been done, or not; far less, is he forbidden to baptize unless with the previous approbation obtained of the bishop. Nevertheless, the intention of the rubric is plain; grounded also on good and catholic principles; and every curate of a parish would be wise in obeying the spirit of it, rather than in proceeding upon a strict interpretation of the letter. Of course, in necessity he would not, as he need not, wait to fulfil the requirements of the rubric: such necessity, though likely enough in many of our colonies, is very improbable at home; and there are few who, if it were possible, in all difficulties like that which is now before us, would not desire to be fortified with the opinion of the bishop, or of "those whom he shall appoint for that purpose."

If then the age of the candidate be such, as would reasonably enable him to form his own conclusions upon the truth of the doctrines of the Church which he is called upon to believe, and the necessity of the baptism which he wishes to receive, it will only remain for us to inquire accurately into the sincerity of his professions. To confer baptism upon persons who do not rightly estimate its blessings, is but to throw pearls before swine. The age, I repeat, will vary in different individuals: but, at any rate, that number of years is not to be required which the civil law has laid

down as the period during which men may not have the management of their temporal affairs.

When, therefore, it is certain that young persons have sufficient ability and knowledge to distinguish and decide upon this matter for themselves, and we have no just reason to suppose that they are insincere, then the declared opposition of their parents must be disregarded. At all times it is but a mere extrinsic particular, in no ways affecting the validity and essence of the sacrament: for, even where no unwillingness is concerned, it is not always that the parents bring children to be baptized, as, for example, in the case of infants exposed and deserted: but they are offered by the whole congregation, and in the common name of all the faithful. S. Augustin says: “Offeruntur parvuli, ad percipiendam spiritalem gratiam non tam ab eis, quorum gestantur manibus (quamvis et ab ipsis, si et ipsi boni fideles sunt) quam ab universa societate sanctorum atque fidelium. Ab omnibus namque offerri recte intelliguntur, quibus placet quod offeruntur, et quorum sancta atque individua caritate ad communicationem Sancti Spiritus adjuvantur. Tota hoc ergo mater ecclesia, quæ in sanctis est, facit: quia tota omnes, tota singulos parit.”<sup>25</sup>

These arguments must not be so interpreted as to destroy all parental authority over persons so young in age as of only ten, twelve, or fourteen years. Doubtless, the younger the candidate may be, the greater

---

<sup>25</sup> *Epist. xcviij. Ad Bonifacium. Opera. tom. 2. p. 266.*

ought to be the amount of caution, the hesitation before approval, and the carefulness in scrutiny, before the priest should venture to receive him. But when he is, at last, properly satisfied in all particulars,—of faith, of honesty, of purity of manners, of ability to judge,—then the opposition of parents can no longer be listened to against the call, made evident, of the Spirit of God. We cannot forget the numerous instances which are in the martyrologies of young men and maidens, nay almost of little children, who have asserted their belief in Christian truth, and have claimed baptism, and withstood even unto death. Such were S. Cyril, and S. Agnes; and many others. These were examples for succeeding generations: these were obedient to the teaching of the Apostles; (who, inquiring, gave us a plain rule, that it is not right in the sight of God to hearken unto men more than unto God;) and were obedient also to the admonition of our Blessed Lord, “If any man come to Me, and hate not his father, and mother, and wife, and children, and brethren, and sisters, yea, and his own life also, he cannot be My disciple.” And, again: “He that loveth father or mother more than Me, is not worthy of Me.”<sup>26</sup>

After baptism so given and so received, (I need scarcely perhaps add) great care and attention are to be paid to the young disciple. He must return in almost every instance to his own home, there to be

---

<sup>26</sup> S. Luke. *ch.* xiv. *v.* 26. S. Matt. *ch.* x. *v.* 37.

subjected to trials of his faith and patience in many ways ; perhaps to violent and undisguised persecution, perhaps to a more subtle and often more successful system of contempt and sneers and ridicule. Hence the old canon-law decreed, and wisely where it had the power of carrying out its precept into practice, that the believing children of unbelievers, should be separated, after baptism, from their parents. “*Judæorum filios vel filias, ne parentum ultra involvantur erroribus, ab errorum consortio separari decernimus, deputatos aut monasteriis, aut Christianis viris, aut mulieribus Deum timentibus, ut sub eorum conversatione cultum fidei discant ; atque in melius instituti tam in moribus, quam in fide proficiant.*”<sup>27</sup>

Let us now pass on to the second of the two classes into which, as I have said, the children of unbelieving and unwilling parents are to be divided. Namely, that which comprehends all who are of very tender age, manifestly incapable of determining for themselves, of making profession of faith, or of demanding baptism.

With regard to these, we may almost say that the Church has ruled that they are not to be baptized ; for I hesitate to consent to that exception which some allow, that the sacrament may rightly be administered, when a child is in the last extremity, and death seems certain and immediate. To admit such a discretionary

---

<sup>27</sup> Decret. *pars.* II. *caus.* xxviiij. *quæst.* I. xj.

of the fourth council of Toledo, in the 7th century.

This is taken from the canons

power would open up a way by which the prohibition itself would be too often unnecessarily evaded. The rule then being so, rests upon a most reasonable foundation. We have no right to interfere with the authority which all parents, by the law both of nature and of revelation, possess over their children, before they are of an age to enable them to judge, in spiritual matters, for themselves. Nor can a course of practice persisted in contrary to this fail to produce anger, and hatred of the Christian Faith, and of the doctrines of the Church, in the minds of parents who, protesting against it, see their children violently baptized. And a more serious danger even than this remains: for what expectation can we have, that such children will grow up and continue faithful members of the Church? must we not rather look for apostasy as the fatal and sure result?

It is, indeed, mainly owing to the principle that the baptized children of unbelieving parents ought not to be remitted to their parents' care, that we must conclude against the opinion that it is proper to baptize them, before they have any discretion of their own. By administration of the sacrament the Church acquires a spiritual jurisdiction and authority over all the recipients: yet this is not such a jurisdiction as is sufficient to put an end to the natural authority of parents. The two clash instantly; but the law which forbids the separation of children during tender infancy, must be obeyed before that which would urge us to baptize them against their parents' will.



Instances are likely to occur, in which the parents differ: the one desiring, the other objecting to, the baptism of their child. Here, in each case, the parish-priest must carefully weigh all the circumstances. Generally, he will of course lean to the carrying out of the old maxim,—true, no less with regard to the law of grace, than to the law of nature,—that favour is to be shewn to the innocent party, and to the increase of the kingdom of God. Still, (for these considerations, and such as these, have place only when the mother is alone consenting,) much hesitation will have to be overcome, before baptism is conferred upon an infant who must be sent back and left under the influence of its father. There will be little room for doubt as to what course is to be adopted, when the father is the consenting party: for as “the husband is the head of the wife,” so has he the chief authority and dominion over their children.

I must acknowledge that a baptism administered, *invitis parentibus*, although irregular, is nevertheless valid, if given with the proper matter and the proper form which are the essentials of the sacrament. Therefore the blessings of regeneration and of admission into the kingdom of heaven surely accompany it: and the infant recipient, if it dies before the commission of any actual sin, is undoubtedly saved. Hence springs the difficulty of all those cases wherein death seems (as I have just said) certain and immediate. The priest may argue, “here there is, at least, no danger of apostasy: and the power of conferring inestimable

blessings is at my discretion." Yet I cannot but believe that he ought not to exercise that power. Unless otherwise commanded by the express voice of the Church, he is bound to restrain his office within the reasonable limits of her general rule; he knows indeed that "he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," but he must not interpret this so as to circumscribe the infinite mercies of the Almighty, and so to shorten His hand, as to declare that otherwise than by baptism He cannot save.

Lyndwood appears to have been of this opinion, although he does not express it, as he does not enter directly into the immediate question before us. "*Sed quid si parentes nolint, vel effectualiter non procuraverint pueros suos baptizari, saltem tempore alicujus solemnitatum prædictarum, sed eos servant usque ad plenioræ ætatem baptizandos? mihi videtur in hoc casu, quod tales parentes errantes in hoc, venient per suos ordinarios corripendi, et ut suos parvulos baptizari faciant celerius quo fieri poterit, sunt cogendi.*"<sup>28</sup> The reader will observe that there is nothing hinted about the propriety of administration of the sacrament, against the consent of the parents.

<sup>28</sup> *Lib. III. tit. 24.* Quod in constitutione. *verb.* ipsis parentibus.

Lyndwood adds. "Maxime ubi consuetudo approbata est, ut quam citius fieri poterit post nativitatem pueri baptizentur. Namque cum

in hoc casu nulla esset parentum rationabilis excusatio, quæ moveret ad differendum baptismum; sic differendo præsumeretur contra tales parentes, quod nollent esse conformes quoad hoc moribus aliorum inter quos conversantur."

Aquinas sums up the doctrine of the schools upon the particular point of this question which we have thus briefly considered.<sup>29</sup> “Dicendum quod pueri infidelium filii aut habent usum rationis, aut non habent: si autem habent, jam quantum ad ea, quæ sunt juris divini, vel naturalis, incipiunt suæ potestatis esse: et ideo propria voluntate, invititis parentibus, possunt baptismum suscipere, sicut et matrimonium contrahere: et ideo *tales licite moneri possunt, et induci ad suscipiendum baptismum.* ¶ Si vero nondum habent usum liberi arbitrii, secundum jus naturale sunt sub cura parentum, quamdiu ipsi sibi providere non possunt: unde etiam et de pueris antiquorum dicitur, quod salvabantur in fide parentum: et ideo *contra justitiam naturalem esset, si tales pueri invititis parentibus baptizarentur*: sicut etiam si aliquis habens usum rationis baptizaretur invitus. *Esset etiam periculosum taliter filios infidelium baptizare*: quia de facili ad infidelitatem redirent propter naturalem affectum ad parentes:

---

<sup>29</sup> I say the particular, because there are several other matters connected with this difficulty, and modifications of it, largely discussed by the ancient canonists and schoolmen: more especially that which concerned the children of slaves, and of nations, infidel themselves, in subjection to a Christian power. Upon this last, the Scotists and Thomists were at variance: the first affirming

the propriety of baptizing such infants, the others denying it. As I have said above, the general rule of the Church, as collected from her practice for many centuries, in all parts of the world, is against administration of the sacrament: but, on the other hand, I do not remember any conciliar or synodal prohibition of it.

et ideo non habet hoc ecclesiæ consuetudo, quod filii infidelium, invitis parentibus, baptizentur.”<sup>30</sup>

<sup>30</sup> Summa. pars. III. quæst. lxviiij. art. 10.

The following arguments are also stated there and answered. “ Videtur, quod pueri Judæorum, vel aliorum infidelium sint baptizandi etiam invitis parentibus. Magis enim debet homini subveniri contra periculum mortis æternæ, quam contra periculum mortis temporalis: sed puero in periculo mortis temporalis existenti est subveniendum, etiamsi parentes per malitiam contraniterentur: ergo multo magis est subveniendum pueris infidelium filiis per baptismum contra periculum mortis æternæ, etiam invitis parentibus.

“ ¶ — 3. Præterea. Quilibet homo est magis Dei, a quo habet animam, quam patris carnalis, a quo habet corpus; non est ergo injustum, si pueri infidelium filii parentibus carnalibus auferantur,

et Deo per baptismum consecrentur.—

“ ¶ Ad primum dicendum quod a morte corporali non est aliquis eripiendus contra ordinem juris civilis, puta si aliquis a suo iudice condemnatur ad mortem, nullus debet eum violenter a morte eripere; unde nec aliquis debet irrumpere ordinem juris naturæ, quo filius est sub cura parentis, ut eum liberet a periculo mortis æternæ.

“ — ¶ Ad tertium dicendum, quod homo ordinatur ad Deum per rationem, per quam Deum cognoscere potest, unde puer, antequam usum rationis habeat, naturali ordine ordinatur in Deum per rationem parentum, quorum curæ naturaliter subjacet, et secundum eorum dispositionem sunt circa ipsum divina agenda.”

## CHAPTER XIII.



HAVE now to speak somewhat upon the third and last particular relating to this holy sacrament of baptism, of the three which I specified above: namely, the spiritual blessings and effects which accompany the reception of it.

These effects are, generally, in the incomplete language of the 27th article;—a visible signing and sealing of the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost. In the precise and formal language of the catechism;—membership of Christ, adoption to be a child of God, and inheritance of the kingdom of heaven: (in other words and in another place,) a death unto sin, and a new birth unto righteousness: for being by nature born in sin, and the children of wrath, we are by baptism made the children of grace. As described in the ritual;—a washing and sanctifying with the Holy Ghost, deliverance from the wrath of God, reception into the ark of Christ's church; remission of sins by spiritual regeneration, an embracing with the arms of God's mercy, a participation of His everlasting kingdom; sanctification with the Holy Ghost, the gift of the kingdom of heaven, and of everlasting life; a burial of the old Adam, and a raising up of the new



man; the death of all carnal affections, the first beginning or the strong encrease of the life and growth of all things belonging to the Spirit; a communication of power and strength to have victory, and to triumph, against the devil, the world, and the flesh; a partaking of the death and resurrection of the Eternal Son, reception of the fulness of Divine Grace, entrance into the number of the faithful and elect of God, regeneration, and grafting into the body of Christ's holy Church.

In such terms does the church of England describe the blessings immediately consequent upon, or rather in operation accompanying, the reception of baptism; fully agreeable to the teaching of her earlier formularies which she has authorized from time to time. Thus the Necessary Doctrine declares;—that in baptism original sin is remitted and taken away; that by the grace then conferred unto us we be made more strong and able to withstand concupiscence and carnal desires; in short, that its effect and virtue is forgiveness of sin, and grace of the Holy Ghost.<sup>1</sup> And the Institution;—that by baptism we have remission of all our sins, the gift of the grace and favour of God, and everlasting life; adoption also to be the very sons and children of God, reception of the Holy Ghost, and cleansing and purification from sins by His most secret

---

<sup>1</sup> Formularies, *etc.* p. 253.    iv. Wilkins, *Concilia*, tom. 4. p.  
Compare *Reformatio Angliæ*. fol. 127.  
7. Also, the Cambridge articles, *n.*

virtue.<sup>2</sup> The articles of 1536 use the like expressions.

A rapid examination of the older documents of our Church will prove her constant and undeviating adherence to the same truths up to the most distant period of her existence, of which any records have come down to us. Take these few: the Exeter synod in the 13th century: “*Baptismus omnibus est necessarium, [sacramentum,] sine quo ad regnum cœlorum minime pervenitur:—adeo est necessarium, quod sine eo non est salus, nec aliis quam baptizatis regni cœlestis janua aperitur.*” And about fifty years before, the council at Durham; “*De virtute vero et efficacia baptismi dicitur, nisi quis renatus fuerit, etc. quasi diceret: qui renatus fuerit ex aqua et Spiritu Sancto, intrabit in regnum cœlorum. Quod usque ad mortem Christi clausum fuit omnibus, sed per sacramentum baptismi, Christi sanguine rubricati, culpa remittitur, periculum vitatur, et ad regnum cœlorum pervenitur, cujus januam Christi sanguis fidelibus suis misericorditer reseravit.*”<sup>3</sup>

Archbishop Ælfric, in his homily on baptism, declares that although no visible change accompanies the dipping of people into the sacred font, and that although to outward appearance they are lifted out of it in the same form as they entered into it, yet the Church knows that every one is sinful before the dipping, and

---

<sup>2</sup> Formularies, p. 93.

<sup>3</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia*, tom. 2. p. 131. tom. 1. p. 575.

rises from it cleansed from sin through that holy baptism. [bið synnfull bedýped innto þam fánte and bið up abróden fram synnum aðwogen þurh þæt halige fulluht.<sup>4</sup>] And, before that time, venerable Bede frequently speaks of the remission of sins in baptism; of cleansing from the contagion of original sin; of being washed from our sins in the baptism of water; and of that forgiveness which is given once for all in the sacrament of baptism; “ea [remissio peccatorum] quæ semel in baptis-mate datur.”<sup>5</sup>

In like manner the ancient rituals of the English church; explaining baptism to be “lavacrum novæ regenerationis,” they assert that all who seek it desire to obtain thereby eternal grace by heavenly regeneration; and to be made temples of the Holy Spirit through the water of the new-birth, for the remission of sins. They speak of the water as prepared by the Divine will for the regenerating of mankind, as being a living fountain, a purifying stream.

All these spiritual blessings, accompanying the due reception of the sacrament of holy baptism,—many in their number, abundant in their privileges, mysterious

<sup>4</sup> Eccl. Angl. vindex cathol. tom. 3. p. 281.

Ælfric repeats the same doctrine in his homily for Easter sunday; *ibid.* p. 350. *cit.* Monum. rit. vol. 1. p. ccij. and see there the extract from the bishop of Salisbury's MS. which, speaking of baptism, declares: “By the

wyche most holy sprynklyng. Off all youre syns youe haue fre perdon.”

<sup>5</sup> Homil. *Opera.* tom. 5. p. 165. 169. 272. 461. “De baptismo, quin instituat in remissionem peccatorum, nemo ambigit.” Bull. *Examen Cens.* p. 234.

in their workings,—may be summed up in the one grace and gift of God, commonly spoken of as Regeneration. And this, even if not strictly and properly, nevertheless according to the received language of both modern and earlier writers.<sup>6</sup> It will serve at any rate my present purpose, so to include all these various graces under that one, in which and with which they are all given and united.

We cannot comprehend, and we cannot therefore explain, baptismal regeneration in the mode of its operation: it is a mystery, and we must be content to believe it as such, and as a most certain truth of the Gospel. This has been well shewn by the very learned author of the work already more than once referred to, Scriptural views of holy baptism: who further remarks that “most of our questions about baptismal regeneration are Nicodemus-questions. ‘How can these things be?’ We know it in its author, God; in its instrument, baptism; in its end, salvation, union with Christ, sonship to God, ‘resurrection from the dead, and the life of the world to come.’ We only know it not, where it does not concern us to know it, in the mode of its operation.—One may then define regeneration to be, that act whereby God takes us out of our relation to Adam, and makes us actual members of His Son, and so His sons, as being members of His ever-blessed Son; and if sons, then heirs of God through

---

<sup>6</sup> Archbishop Laurence says and *regeneration* as synonymous that the fathers regarded *baptism* terms, *p.* 6.

Christ. — This is our new birth, an actual birth of God, of water and the Spirit, as we were actually born of our natural parents ; herein then also are we justified, or both accounted and made righteous, since we were made members of Him Who is alone Righteous ; freed from sins past, whether original or actual ; have a new principle of life imparted to us, since having been made members of Christ, we have a portion of His life, or of Him Who is our life ; herein we have also the hope of the resurrection and of immortality, because we have been made partakers of His resurrection, have risen again with Him.”<sup>7</sup>

Similar descriptions of regeneration in baptism may be found in other writers of our Church ; I shall not discuss it, because, as I have already said, it does not fall within the scope of the work which I have proposed to myself in this dissertation : and, moreover, it has been examined and insisted on, and proved to be the doctrine of the Catholic Church from the beginning, as it is now the doctrine of the church of England in particular, at great length, (not to name earlier authors, such as Hooker, or Waterland,) in the treatise from which I have just quoted, and in the very excellent works of bishop Bethell, and archbishop Laurence.

I have, therefore, only to remind the reader that the Church of Christ, in her undeviating enunciation of this vital truth, baptismal regeneration, has ever

---

<sup>7</sup> P. 25.



grounded and maintained it upon these two texts, especially: "Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." And: "According to His mercy He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost."<sup>8</sup>

And let it further be remembered,—by those, at least, who look to as their guide the teaching of the catholic Church, and have reliance upon the testimony of the first ages of the Faith, including the contemporaries of the apostles themselves, rather than upon the fantastic notions which may be invented, (not uneasily, at any time,) by the perverse cleverness of unassisted or misdirected human intellect,—let it, I say, further be remembered that whilst upon the one hand, for the first thousand years, there cannot be produced one single statement, one vestige of exposition, made by the Church, or by any branch of her, which does not explain these texts as referring, and alone referring, to the gifts of God to man in baptism, so, upon the other hand, there are innumerable writers by whom the texts are plainly and distinctly so referred and explained. The consent of the rituals, from the present day up to the earliest records of any which exist, is equally positive and unanimous.

When, therefore, we find new expositions in after-days, interpreting these texts to support a theory;

---

<sup>8</sup> S. John. *ch.* iij. *v.* 5. Titus. *ch.* iij. *v.* 5.

and, far from literally, in opposition to the first obvious meaning of the words ; of what account are we to make them or at what value can we esteem them, in comparison with the weight and the authority of the voice of the Church of Christ, which He Himself appointed as the witness and the keeper of His sacred words, and to be the sure channel of their one true meaning ? However wide present reception of such theories and arguments may be, however numberless the favourers of them, those arguments must be traced to their first fountain and original. I do believe that in the instance now before us, the extent to which the error is accepted is vastly overrated, perhaps to serve a purpose. But, say that almost the whole world was overrun with the plague ; say that seven thousand only were left who bow not the knee to Baal ;—and, that some must be left until the last great day, is a most certain truth, because the Church can never fail, nor can the gates of hell prevail against her ;—say all this ; and still denial of the catholic doctrine of baptismal regeneration, a denial resting on such beginnings, owning so young a parentage as to claim, nay to boast of, for its first supporters, men as it were of yesterday, is to be thought dust in the balance, or the shadow of a cloud.

In saying that they, who first supported opinions upon regeneration in baptism against the judgment of the Church, were but of yesterday, I do not mean that attempts had not been made, to propagate such teach-

ing at earlier periods ; but then faintly, and at wide intervals, and with small success : each attempt serving only to strengthen and illustrate the truth. It was not until the sixteenth century that rejection of it, as a doctrine, was at last established ; amidst the uproar which inevitably accompanied the reformation ; when there seemed for a time to be “no judge in Israel,” and the aim of each fanatic to be, by adopting or inventing some wild theory or other, to exceed his neighbours. Then, at last, the weakened and divided Church gave way : she could no longer repress, as of old, with the overwhelming condemnation of an œcumenical council, the errors of her rebellious children : and so they took root, and quickly spread, and strengthened, amidst the ruins of fallen Churches ; nourished and tended by great names, authorities of the time, on whom men fondly leaned. But who are Calvin, and Bucer, and Zuingle, that they should be heard rather than S. Augustin or S. Ambrose, S. Chrysostom, S. Justin, or S. Clement,—in a word—rather than, and in opposition to, the one constant voice of the One Holy Catholic Church ?

There is another point upon which also I would make an observation. Much has been written in proof of the “character” which is received in the sacrament of baptism, and that it is indelible : and, on the other hand, the assertion of this opinion has met with great opposition.

With regard to the doctrine of the church of Rome

in this particular, the ninth canon of the seventh session of the council of Trent,<sup>9</sup> both insisted on the absolute necessity of holding it, and explained what we are to understand by it. “Si quis dixerit, in tribus sacramentis, baptismo scilicet, confirmatione, et ordine, non imprimi characterem in anima, hoc est signum quoddam spirituale, et indelebile, unde ea iterari non possunt; anathema sit.” This canon was scarcely more than a repetition of the statement in the famous decree of concord, after the council of Florence: “Inter hæc sacramenta, tria sunt, baptismus, confirmatio, et ordo, quæ characterem, id est, spirituale quoddam signum à cæteris distinctivum, imprimunt in anima indelebile. Unde in eadem persona non reiterantur.”<sup>10</sup>

Scotus tells us the definition which the schoolmen gave of the “character.” “Theologi concipiunt communiter per characterem quoddam spirituale impressum à Deo suscipienti sacramentum non iterabile. Ex ista ratione nominis sequuntur aliquæ proprietates characteris, quarum duæ sunt communes sibi et cuilibet formæ, sc. quod est forma assimilativa alii habenti; et quod est forma distinctiva a non habente. Et aliæ speciales, quarum una est, quod est signum rememorativum sacramenti suscepti; alia, quod est signum conformativum Christo, cujus sacramentum suscipitur; et etiam obligatorium ei, eo modo, quo suscipiens sa-

---

<sup>9</sup> De sacram. in genere.

<sup>10</sup> Concil. Mansi. tom. xxxi. p. 1054.

cramentum obligatur per ejus susceptionem.”<sup>11</sup> If the reader wishes to examine the minute distinctions and inquiries which the schoolmen further made in this question, he will find it argued, especially, in this part of the work of Duns Scotus, and in the Summa of Aquinas.<sup>12</sup>

Notwithstanding the decrees of the councils of Trent and Florence, making the reception of this doctrine of a “character” in baptism to be *de fide*, the theologians of the church of Rome are obliged to confess, that not only was it not so enforced until the 15th century, but that Scripture is doubtful, to say the least, with regard to it, and that until the 12th century evident traces of it are not to be found in any writer. It follows therefore that these decisions rest only upon an interpretation of some passages in the New Testament, confirmed, as they say, by the constant tradition and sense of the Church; implied, if not explicit.

The Scriptures cited are these: “Who hath also sealed us, and given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts.” Again; “In Whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise.” One other; “Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemp-

<sup>11</sup> Sentent. lib. iv. dist. vi. qu. 9. Cf. *Reportat. Paris.*

<sup>12</sup> Pars. III. qu. lxij. There was much variety between the judgments of these two, Aquinas and Scotus: and their followers,

although siding generally either with the one or the other, yet found it more difficult to decide what the “character” is, than what it is not.



tion.”<sup>13</sup> These are but slight foundations upon which we may build up such distinct and positive assertions, to be of necessity believed.

Not that I would dispute, holding it as a pious opinion, that in the sacrament of baptism there is a something, (I know not what to name it,) whether character, or mark, or seal, or sign, conveyed and given also, indelible, eternal; imprinted both upon soul and body; ever distinguishing not only in this world but in the world to come those who have once received it, from all who have died unbaptized. And for this, I rely first and strongly upon the texts which have been just cited from the epistles of S. Paul.

Secondly and strongly also, upon many passages in some of the greatest fathers to the like effect. Thus, not to heap up examples upon this point, we cannot but listen to S. Cyril of Jerusalem, who warns all candidates for holy baptism that “it is a serious matter, and solemnly to be approached: that each, so coming, is on the point of being presented to God, before innumerable hosts of angels:<sup>14</sup> that the Holy Ghost is

<sup>13</sup> 2 Cor. *ch. j. v. 22.* Ephes. *ch. j. v. 13. ch. iv. v. 30.*

<sup>14</sup> That the Holy Angels are especially present at the solemn celebration of the Christian sacraments, is a doctrine frequently insisted upon by the fathers. Bishop Morton tells us, “Divine Nazianzene teacheth [*Orat. xl. de bapt.*] that the Angels are

present at baptisme, and doe magnifie, or honour it with their presence, and observance.” Of the sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ. *part. 2. p. 78. edit. 1631.* See also Albertin, *de euch. p. 549.*

Nor for once, can I resist quoting at length a passage in the Anglo-saxon ecclesiastical insti-

about to set a seal upon each soul, and enlist every one under the Great King." Again, "that in baptism the Holy Ghost is present to seal the soul, and set upon it a sacred and heavenly seal, at which evil spirits tremble."<sup>15</sup> Or to S. Chrysostom, and S. Augustin, comparing the indelible seal of the Spirit put, in baptism, upon true believers, to the mark set upon soldiers.<sup>16</sup> Or to S. Gregory Nazianzen and other fathers, urging again and again upon us the remembrance of the seal which we received in baptism, and of the mark, the "character," which was then impressed upon us.<sup>17</sup>

And now, in conclusion, I desire only to make a few remarks upon a subject which, although it really seems to me not open to any dispute at all, has nevertheless been repeatedly debated during the last hundred years; namely, the judgment of the church of England upon the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, as expressed and settled by herself in her modern ritual and other formularies. I have already said more than once, that

tutes, which I have already cited in another work. "Much is the supplication and great is the hallowing, which sendeth away devils and putteth them to flight, as often as baptism is performed or housel hallowed: and holy angels hover there around, and protect the deeds, and through God's powers support the priests, as often as they rightly minister to

Christ." *Cit. Ancient Liturgy. p. cxlv.*

<sup>15</sup> Catech. 3. §. iij. 17. §. xxxv.

<sup>16</sup> S. Chrys. *Hom. 3. in 2. Cor.* S. Aug. *tr. vj. in Joan.* Contra Parmenian. *lib. 2. cap. xij.*

<sup>17</sup> Naz. *orat. xl. de bapt.* S. Aug. *loc. cit. Damascen. de fide. lib. iv. cap. 9.* S. Basil. *exhort. ad bapt. n. 5. de Spiritu S. cap. 15.*

very learned bishops and other writers in our church have proved to demonstration that her doctrine in this matter is fully agreeable to the constant teaching of the Catholic Church from the days of the apostles: proved it, against all kinds of sophistical explanations, and deliberate assertions contradictory and false; proved it to demonstration, in the judgment of those who are not determined to call black white, and to uphold their own opinions at whatever risk to their reputation for the common virtues of honesty and truth.

But there is an argument which has not been, so far as I remember, urged in support of the real meaning which can alone be put upon the ritual and formularies of our Church; (supposing, that is, that it does admit of doubt;) and yet one, which cannot but have great weight. Denial of the doctrine of regeneration in baptism, did not spring up after the middle of the sixteenth century; after, that is, the first alterations which took place in our service-books and formularies. Long before the time of the puritans of the commonwealth, or of the days of K. James and Elizabeth,—before Whittaker, and Fulke, Cartwright or Travers; before even their great master, Calvin;—there were writers who had taught the same doctrine with them; this, perhaps, not with the help of the numerous supports which was given to their successors, but still with an openness and perseverance amply sufficient to make their opinions well known; and, whether worthy of it or not, to be deliberated upon, and either approved or condemned.

I shall endeavour to shew the truth of this by some extracts from the works of two or three writers, of acknowledged authority of a certain kind, to which many others might easily be added, if I thought that it was in any way necessary.

First, however, take the following from the *Concilia*: the fact of the condemnation of such errors and heresies is evidence of the extent to which they were reaching; these then were condemned in a mandate to the university of Oxford, by the archbishop, in the year 1368, together with others. “4. Sacramentum baptismi non est de lege Dei alicui parvulo decedenti requisitum ad salutem æternam, si intelligatur universaliter, quod nullum sacramentum, etc. *error*.—6. De quolibet parvulo baptizato decedente, an salvabitur, seu damnabitur, est à quolibet catholico dubitandum: *error*.—8. Non est possibile de lege communi aliquem pro solo originali peccato damnari: *error*.”<sup>18</sup>

Again, among the tenets propounded by the Wickliffites, was this; and although, as I have stated in a preceding chapter, it may possibly be interpreted not

<sup>18</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia. tom. 3. p. 75.*

Probably much in these and similar errors is to be traced to the Waldenses, Albigenses, and other heretics of earlier times. Many proofs of the opinions maintained by those sects from contemporary authors have been collected by Dr. Maitland. I cannot too

strongly recommend to the reader his most able and learned work on the Waldenses: especially valuable as an exposure of the ignorance and conceit, (if not of something worse,) displayed by Milner in his, so-called, *Church History*: a book below the level even of the time and of the party for which it was put together.

unfavourably and merely as objecting against a too severe opinion advanced on the contrary, it is nevertheless itself a proposition apparently opposed to the constant decrees of the Church, and to the words of Holy Scripture. The reader may form his own judgment upon it. “Item, quod definient parvulos fidelium sine baptismo sacramentali decedentes, non fore salvandos, sunt in hoc præsumptuosi et stolidi. *Error est.*”<sup>19</sup>

In the year 1530, among other heretical propositions gathered out of books at that time dispersed actively through the country, were these: “That the children of faith be under noo lawe.—The water of the fonte hath noo more vertue in it than hath the water of ryuer. [This may be true in one sense, and has been spoken of: but then there follows,] The baptisme lyeth not in halowed water, or in other outward thinge, but in the faith oonly.—The water of baptisme is noo thinge but a signe that we must be under the standard of the crosse.—Infants be holy and clene, thoo they haue not receyued baptisme, because their parents be holy and clene.”<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> Wilkins, *Concilia*, tom. 3. p. 229. cf. p. 344.

<sup>20</sup> *Ibid.* p. 729. 730. 734. As to the “vertue of the water of the fonte,” some help towards the true interpretation to be put upon the statement in the text, as intended by the promulgators of it, may be obtained from a similar assertion complained of by the convo-

cation, in the same year. *Ibid.* p. 805.

Whether in or out of place here, I conceive that the reader may not object to my inserting, out of some articles *de reformatione ecclesiæ* published by the university of Oxford, in 1414, a curious argument against the doctrine of the community of Christian men’s



I shall pass on almost immediately to other statements which were advanced by writers, held in repute by some persons, of the early and middle part of the sixteenth century: but I would first digress shortly to make a remark or two about the peculiar teaching of Wickliffe and his followers during the preceding century. Among the many errors which they and the Lollards promulgated contrary to the great doctrines of the Church, both as to faith and discipline, their assertions in denial of Catholic truth, with regard to the sacrament of baptism, were neither so plainly expressed, nor excited so much contention, as those which they advanced with regard to other doctrines, such for example as of the sacrament of the Blessed Eucharist, or of Holy Orders. The writings of Wickliffe himself, moreover, have not (I believe) been collected; probably many are lost, and of the rest, few are to be found except, still in manuscript, in our public libraries. Nevertheless, there is sufficient evidence from passages which have been produced against him by his contemporaries, to prove the character of his opinions upon this, as upon other subjects. I shall not do more

goods, and one which I do not remember to have seen advanced elsewhere. "Plerumque proclamatur à pluribus, quod si pagani et infideles, suæ gentilitatis errore deposito, in sacri baptismatis fonte voluerint expurgari, bona illorum temporalia ecclesiæ consecrantur, quod multos Judæorum, ut credi-

tur, trahit à baptismo. Pium igitur esset et meritorium toti concilio, ordinare remedium præmissis. Cum enim Philippus baptizavit eunuchum, currum suum ab eo non abstulit, neque bona, quæ secum attulit ad baptizandum." *Ibid. tom. 3. p. 363.*

than lay before the reader two or three examples from the works of a very learned English author of the beginning of the fifteenth century, Thomas Waldensis.<sup>21</sup>

In the following place, Wickliffe cannot be understood except as disputing against the necessity of baptism with water, and that baptism with the Spirit is of itself sufficient: thus, in anticipation, arguing upon that dangerous system, against which we are thus warned by the author of the Ecclesiastical Polity. "When the letter of the law hath two things plainly and expressly specified, Water, and the Spirit, water as a duty required on our parts, the Spirit as a gift which God bestoweth, there is danger in presuming so to interpret it, as if the clause which concerneth ourselves were more than needeth."<sup>22</sup> Such a mode of dealing with Holy Scripture Wickliffe did not fear to use. He says; "Baptismus flaminis est baptismus Spiritus Sancti. Item duo baptismi priores [sc. sanguinis et fluminis] sunt ut signa antecedentia, et ex suppositione necessaria ad istum tertium baptismum flaminis. Ideo absque dubitatione, si iste insensibilis baptismus affuerit, baptizatus a crimine est mundatus: et si ille defuerit, quantumcunque adsint priores, baptismus non prodest animæ ad salutem. Ideo cum iste sit insensibilis tantum, et nobis incognitus, videtur

---

<sup>21</sup> Wickliffe died in 1387. Waldensis was at the council of Pisa in 1409. Cave; *Hist. Literaria*,

sæc. synodale. p. 112.

<sup>22</sup> Vol. 2. p. 337.

mihi imprudens præsumptio taliter damnationem hominis, vel salvationem, ex baptisate definire.”<sup>23</sup>

None would pretend (I suppose) that baptism with water without the Spirit would save a man : but Wickliffe therefore goes on to conclude that the Spirit without water can and ordinarily does so : for, he contends, if there can be no baptism without the gift of grace accompanying it, therefore whoever is baptized, (whether in faith, or unbelieving, whether adult opposing or infant not opposing any obstacle) necessarily receives Divine Grace, and must be saved. But, says Waldensis, S. Augustine has well distinguished between the grace of the sacrament, and the sacrament of grace. For the grace of the sacrament does not desert the sacrament, whosoever may be either the minister or the recipient : as therefore the sacrament is always whole and complete, so also is the grace of the sacrament. But the sacrament of grace is when it effects in a worthy recipient that which it figures, namely, grace itself and forgiveness of sins. Which indeed neither does nor can be immediately in the case of those who receive unworthily : nevertheless, upon conversion to God, of Whom are the sacrament and the grace, the sacrament of grace at length has its effect and operation by the grace of the sacrament once for all, and, it may be, long before conferred, whose character and mark have never been removed.

---

<sup>23</sup> Trialog. cap. xij. cit. Wald. doctrin. fid. cap. xcviij.

Other extracts from Wickliffe's writings shew, that, like others who succeeded him, unable to resist the force of the text, "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, *etc.*" he denied that the water there spoken of is to be referred to the waters of baptism. but, on the contrary, to the water which flowed from the side of our Blessed Lord upon the cross.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>24</sup> S. Augustin notices, not condemning it, the opinion of some that the penitent thief did indeed receive baptism with that Sacred Water, as It sprung from the Saviour's side. "Creditur, aqua simul cum sanguine exiliente de latere Domini, juxta confixus potuisse perfundi, atque hujusmodi sanctissimo baptismate dilui." De anima. *lib.* 3. *cap.* ix. §. 12. Opera. *tom.* 10. *p.* 379. S. Hilary, *de Trinit.* *lib.* 10, and S. Jerome, *epist.* 13, speak of him as a martyr, inasmuch as he bore testimony to the truth, and to the Divinity of our Lord, when all others had seemed to have forsaken Him. The tradition of the Church is that his name was Titus: and both the eastern and western Churches set apart a day in commemoration of him.

From the above exposition of the text, S. John, *iiij.* 5. by Wickliffe, we must perhaps refuse in strictness that originality which some have given to Calvin as to the same matter. "I believe,"

says Dr. Wall, "Calvin was the first that ever denied this place to mean baptism." *Infant Bapt.* *vol.* 2. *p.* 180.

Here let me add also, (as important in its bearing upon this point now before us, no less than on others more immediately probably before the mind of its writer,) the following extract from the Life of Wickliffe, by one who, both learned and moderate, is his best apologist. "If the reformation of our Church had been conducted by Wiclif, his work, in all probability, would nearly have anticipated the labours of Calvin; and the Protestantism of England might have pretty closely resembled the Protestantism of Geneva. Episcopal government might then have been discarded,—and, lastly, the fatalism which lurked [scarcely *lurked*] in the scholastic writings of the reformer, might then, possibly, have raised up its head, and boldly demanded a place in the Confession of the National church. Had Wiclif flourished in the xvjth

I shall take now two or three places from the books published by Tyndal. Passing over such kind of statements as, that "Tribulation is our right baptisme," and this, not with reference to the Catholic doctrine of martyrdom, but a tribulation which is "signified by plunging into the water;"—or, that baptism without preaching helpeth not;—or, that true baptism is within in the heart, in the spirit;<sup>25</sup>—of which many examples might be brought forward; let the reader consider the meaning in which such passages as the following are to be received. "It is impossible," he says, "that the water of the riuer should wash our heartes:—and if a man alledge Christ, John in the iij chapter saying, *Except a man*, etc. and will therefore that the holy Ghost be present in the water, and therefore the very deede, or worke doth put away sin, I will send hym unto Paul which asketh his Galathians, whether they receaued the holy Ghost by the dede of the law, or by preaching of faith.—So now if baptisme preach me the washyng in Christe's bloud, so doth the holy ghost accompany it, and that deede of preachyng throughe faith doth put away my

century, it can hardly be imagined that he would have been found under the banners of Cranmer and of Ridley. Their caution, their patience, their moderation, would scarcely have been intelligible to him; and rather than conform to it, he might, perhaps, have been ready, if needful, to

*perish in the gainsaying* of such men as Knox and Cartwright." Le Bas. p. 365.

<sup>25</sup> I cite from his collected works, *edit.* 1573. *Pref. to the Obed. of a Christian man.* p. 99. *Obedience.* p. 143. *Of Sacram. and Cerem.* p. 276.



sinnes. For the holy Ghost is no dome God, nor no God that goeth a mummynge.”<sup>26</sup> The irreverence displayed in the conclusion of this sentence, has almost made me doubt whether I would quote it.

Again ; “The inward baptisme of the soule, is the baptisme that onely auayleth in the sight of God, the new generation,—the earnest of euerlastyng lyfe, and title whereby we chalenge our inheritaunce.” This inward baptism having been just before declared to be “to loue the law, and to long for the life to come.”<sup>27</sup>

Once more : “The worke of baptisme, that outward washing, justifieth us not.—Faith doth receave that promise and that righteousness, and God doth geue it and impute it to faith, and not to y<sup>e</sup> washing. And the washing doth testifie it, and certifie us of it, as the pope’s letters do certifie the belieuers of the pope’s pardons. Now the letters helpe not, or hinder, *etc.*” This is in his exposition of the vi<sup>th</sup> ch. of S. Matthew, and is further explained in his treatise “upon signes and sacramentes,” where we are told that “neither our saluation so greatly standeth in baptism or any other sacrament, that we could not be saued without them, by preachyng the word onely.”<sup>28</sup>

<sup>26</sup> Prologue upon Leviticus. *p.* 13.

<sup>27</sup> Expos. of v<sup>th</sup> Ch. of S. Matt. *prol. p.* 187.

<sup>28</sup> *P.* 226. 441. It may not be out of the way to add that, as to

confirmation, Tyndal in like manner taught that as the Holy Ghost is not given “through ceremonies,” the putting on of hands doth neither help nor hinder : and that the use of such “gestures,”

We go on now to another author, contemporary with Tyndal; John Frith. He argues in like manner, that because baptism without faith cannot save a man, therefore, that with faith, and where no such obstacle as want of it, or of sincerity, or of repentance, exists, it also is a mere bare sign, working no effect, and conveying no grace, or spiritual blessing. "This outward signe," he says, "doth neither geue us the spirite of God, neither yet grace that is the favour of God. For if thorough the washyng in the water the spirite or grace were geuen, then shold it folow that who soeuer were baptized in water should receive this precious gift, but that is not so, wherefore I must needes conclude that this outward signe by any power or influence that it hath, bryngeth not the spirite or fauour of God.—Baptisme bryngeth not grace, but doth testifie unto the congregation that he which is baptised had such grace geuen hym before; it is a sacrament, that is, a signe of an holy thyng, euen a token of the grace and free mercy whiche was before geuen hym." If baptism be indeed so mere and apparently worthless a ceremony, we might suppose that there would be

---

whether by our bishops now, or by the apostles as recorded in the 13th ch. of the Acts, are to be regarded "as it is our maner to holde up our handes, when we pray, and as some kisse their thome nayle, and put it to their eyes, etc." Obedience of a Chris-

tian man. *p.* 152. In another place he does not hesitate to assert that because women may, in cases of urgent necessity, baptize, so they may likewise minister the other sacraments as well as the priest. *Answer unto M. More. p.* 322.

little harm in discontinuing it altogether, and Frith thus meets this objection. “Although it seeme neuer so exterior a thing, yet ought it to be had in great price and much reuerence, because it was commanded of God to be done. Besides that it is an outward signe or witnesse unto the congregation of the invisible promise geuen before by grace unto euery priuate man.”<sup>29</sup>

I shall quote from one more writer; it is unnecessary for me to weary the reader with similar extracts, which might easily be collected from various books of the first half of the sixteenth century. We will therefore only take in addition a place or two from the works of bishop Hooper. It is true that they were published before he was nominated to his bishopric, and it is very probable that he might have changed his notions on this subject afterwards, as he certainly did change, and gave up like erroneous opinions, on other matters. But this is not a question of any importance whatever, and even if it were so would not have the slightest bearing upon the purpose for which I now refer to his books.

“Baptism,” we are told, “sanctifieth no man:—external baptism is but an inauguration or external consecration of those, that first believed and were cleansed of their sin.—Infants be examined concerning repentance and faith, before they be baptized with water; at the contemplation of the which faith, God

---

<sup>29</sup> A declaration of baptisme. p. 91. 92. 94.

purgeth the soul." Then, proceeding to argue from the fact that a king is a true king in this realm before coronation,<sup>30</sup> he continues: "So is it in the church of Christ: man is made the brother of Christ, and heir of eternal life by God's only mercy received by faith, before he receive any ceremony to confirm and manifest openly his right and title."<sup>31</sup> In the Answer to the bishop of Winchester's book, baptism is declared to be a seal "in the assurance of remission of sin which has first been in spirit received by faith;" and, that as "the promise of God, the remission of sin, appertaineth not only unto the father, but also unto the seed of the father,—it is ill done to condemn the infants of the Christians that die without baptism, of whose salvation by the scripture we be assured."<sup>32</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> "An apt similitude," says the margin: upon which there may be two opinions.

<sup>31</sup> A declaration of Christ and his office. *ch. x.*

<sup>32</sup> In another place, shortly after, he repeats: "we may not doubt of the salvation of the infants of Christians, that die before they be christened." If we may well say, that there is not sufficient ground in scripture to demand our assent to conclusions which condemn infants unbaptized, we must also feel that there is none on which to build up such positive assertions as the above.

With how much more mode-

ration and learning does the dean of Carlisle, early in the next century, explain the wise judgment of the church of England. "Protestants do not deny the vertue and efficacie of baptisme, to sanctifie men, but according to the holy scriptures, and the antient church, they teach and maintaine, that this sacrament is an instrument of sanctification, and remission of sinnes.—Our church provideth diligentlie, that all infants (if it be possible) may receive baptisme before they depart this life. But if it fall out inevitable, that new borne babes, descending of Christian parents, cannot receiue this

The interrogatories and answers of sponsors in *public and solemn* baptism, are alleged to show that baptism is but “the confirmation of Christ’s promises, which be in the person that receiveth the sacrament before, or else these external signs availeth nothing:” those answers being made, “then is the child christened in the name of God. The which fact doth openly confirm the remission of sin, received before by faith.” <sup>33</sup>

sacrament, it is more pious to hope of God’s indulgence towards such infants, than to aggravate His vengeance with rigour and extremities.” *White; Replie to Fisher. p. 176.*

The consequence of such unrestrained and unsound teaching by others, as well as by Hooper in those days, soon made itself evident, in a growing neglect of infant-baptism. For example, one of bishop Ridley’s articles in 1550 enquired, “Whether any speaketh against baptism of infants?” and again, it was ordered in the same diocese, in 1553, “that children be christened by the priest, and confirmed by the bishops, as heretofore hath been accustomed and used.” *Wilkins, Concilia. tom. iv. p. 61. 90.*

<sup>33</sup> Reprint, Parker society. *p. 128.*

Not to insist on the omission by Hooper of all reference to the object or use of *private* baptism, in cases of necessity, I would refer

the reader to Waterland upon this notion, so much insisted on in modern times, that baptism does not give and *convey*, but *seals* grace and forgiveness already given. He declares that, on the contrary, baptism is “by Divine appointment, *the ordinary instrument* for conveying the grace of justification. Scripture and antiquity are clear in this matter, and so likewise are our church-forms; particularly our baptismal offices, catechism, and confirmation.” View of the doctrine of Justification. *Works. vol. 6. p. 21.*

Taverner in his Postills uses the illustration of a seal, in its proper sense: “baptisme wythout feith (either of the party selfe, or of them that bringe hym to baptisme, yf it be a chylde that is baptized) is nothyng worth, but it is lyke to a paper that hath a seale hangyng to it, and hath no writyng in it. Wherefore they that haue the visible sygnes wythout the inuisible feith, they haue



We learn then from these extracts out of writings both before and contemporaneous with the revision of the ritual of the church of England, and her expositions of doctrine set forth during the sixteenth century, the existence of a definite system of teaching upon the effect of, and upon the blessings conveyed by, reception of the sacrament of baptism. This system had been over and over again condemned by councils, both

seales wythout writinges." There is an obscurity in this passage, which the author himself explains in another postill, with especial reference to it: "Wherfore (as it was declared vnto you on the Ascension day) baptisme without fayth is as who should say, a paper sealed without any wryting in it. But ye shall alwayes vnderstand that I excepte and speake not of the baptisme of infauntes or babes. For they be saued, if after baptisme they chaunce in theyr infauncy to dye, by the faythe of the catholyke church." *Oxford edit. p. 295. 320.*

In the same manner archbishop Ælfric, in his homilies, speaks of the faith of the Church as availing for infants: he says; "Unspeaking children are baptized through the belief of the father and of the mother;—for the sentence is very awful that Christ spake, That no unbaptized man shall come to eternal life. Now this law stands in God's church,

that unspeaking children be baptized, and they shall be saved through the belief of other men, as through other men's sins they had been condemned." *Sermon on the Lord's Epiphany. vol. 2. p. 51.*

Here also, by way of further illustration, I would quote once more from the book of Postills, already spoken of above; *p. 295, note 28.* "Christe saith on this wise; Excepte a man be borne of water, *etc.* Here thou hearest, that this regeneration and new natiuity, beginneth in baptisme. For baptisme is a signe of mortefynge our flesh, as S. Paule saith; we be buried with him by baptisme into death, *etc.* and this is one part of this new natiuity. Furthermore, in baptysme the holy ghoste ys geuen vs, whych, we beyng so mortefied, doth reuyue and regenerate us agayne, ruleth, draweth, pulleth, and chaungeth vs." *Sermon on Trinitye son-day. sign. N. viij. b.*

diocesan and provincial, of the English church; it was plainly opposed to the rituals which had been in use from the beginning; it had been still insisted on, enforced, and spread by men who nevertheless believed in the correctness of it, and that it was not contrary to the truth as contained in Holy Scripture, and held by the primitive Church; lastly, as a system, it was known to and understood by those, to whose judgment the alterations which it would be wise to make in the ancient service-books were committed. Will any person prove there is even an appearance of evidence in any of the authoritative documents and formularies of our Church during the last three hundred years,—in ritual, liturgy, catechism, articles, or canons,—from which we can fairly conclude that this system, so often rejected in earlier ages, was at last adopted? I think not. Will any person point out the actual changes which were made in the ritual, in order to accommodate and make room for the admission of the new system, in place of and in contradiction to the old faith? I think not. Or, once more; will any person produce a plain, dogmatic assertion, agreed upon and published by the church of England, since the year 1545, condemning her ancient doctrine upon baptism? I think not.

It would surely be both ridiculous and dishonest to propose such questions as the above with reference to some other doctrines, taught during several centuries by the church of England to be believed as of necessity to salvation, but now so taught no longer. For ex-

ample, as to the sacraments in general, or the sacrament of the blessed eucharist in particular, or auricular confession, or purgatory, or invocation of saints. Why then may we ask them concerning the sacrament of baptism? I can conceive one answer, and one answer only: namely, this; that the Church of England now holds, teaches, and maintains, without change or alteration or addition or omission in any one particular, the same faith regarding the necessity, the blessings, and the effects of the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, which she ever held, — whether before or since the sixteenth century, — up to the days of S. Anselm, and Bede, and S. Augustin; up to the days of the holy apostles, when the Faith was once for all delivered to the Saints.

**Domine Dominus noster, quam admirabile est nomen tuum in universa terra! quoniam elevata est magnificentia tua super coelos.**

**Ex ore infantium et lactentium perfecisti laudem.**

**Domine Dominus noster, quam admirabile est nomen tuum in universa terra!**



## Appendix.



## Appendix.

**I** HAVE not thought it right to make additions to this work, in a second edition, so very shortly after the publication of the first. But I desire to notice, briefly, one or two difficulties which have been proposed to me, having respect chiefly to doubtful baptism, and hypothetical administration. This I shall do in an appendix, of which a sufficient number of copies will be printed, to bind up with the former edition. And the easiest method, as well as the most natural, will be to adopt generally the words in which the cases have been stated to me. I am not concerned to shew that they are all of equal importance, or of equal difficulty: my wish is that they may serve also as specimens of the various practical doubts which are involved in the subject of this dissertation.

I. The first case was of a person alleged to have been baptized by a Wesleyan teacher, and in which the evidence was sufficient that both the proper Matter and the proper Form had been used. My correspondent continues: "I apprehend your opinion is clear against using the conditional form of rebaptization in such a case; but my question is, is there any and what form proper to be observed in admitting such a person into the Church, assuming him to be in a proper state? In our ritual the office which is appointed to be used after the administration of private baptism, seems clearly to be *intended* only for the case of infants privately baptized in emergency. But, supposing that it may be used equally in a case such as I have described, the rubric does not seem to be applicable: it deals only with the case of *lawful ministers*. Of course this does not infer any opinion towards conditional, still less unconditional, administration: but how can that office be used? if it cannot, what other form is there? And if no form

be used, how can the person receive confirmation, which implies a repetition of a baptismal vow which was never pronounced? The Wesleyan baptism, as I understand, having nothing but the essential form and matter?

“Setting this last difficulty aside, I certainly always used to think that confirmation and admission to communion were all the public acts requisite in such a case, after due private examination of the candidate.

“I have heard of certain admissions of Roman Catholics into our communion, under the direction of the bishop of ———, with some sort of religious service.”

My answer was to this effect:

If, after due examination, it is evident that the alleged baptism had been administered with both the proper form and matter, it ought to be acknowledged as valid; the minister not being of the essence of the sacrament. The assertion that the rubric, by the term “lawful minister,” excludes all except priests and deacons, has been examined at great length in the dissertation; and I trust it has been there proved, that “lawful minister,” with regard to the sacrament of baptism, includes, under certain circumstances, not only persons clerical, but lay; whether in the Church, or out of it.

There is no other Office appointed to be used, in the church of England, for receiving a child, already baptized, “as one of the flock of true Christian people,” than that which is supplementary to the Office entitled “The ministration of private baptism of children in houses:” nor can any other Form be used.

Confirmation cannot supply any defects, regarding essentials, in an alleged baptism. If an adult, whose baptism is valid, is to be received into communion, an examination by the priest into both sincerity of repentance and purity of faith, and also a distinct renunciation by the candidate of errors hitherto held, ought to precede confirmation: which would, in a certain sense, *ratify* the former true baptism, and convey its own especial blessings. Upon this point, the statement of Ursinus, as given by Gennadius, is to the purpose: quoted in the Dissertation, *ch. vi. note 1.*

There is not, in reality, any difficulty in the enquiry “how can a person baptized by a Wesleyan receive confirmation, which implies a repetition of a baptismal vow which was never pronounced?” The case of such an one, is parallel with that of children who, having been privately baptized by a priest of the church of England, have not subsequently been, (as we commonly term it) “christened.” The sponsors, and the verbal promises made by them for infants, and the public admission into the visible body of the Church, and the signing with the sign of the cross, are, strictly, a matter of discipline: involving things of very high importance, and of obligation to be observed, and performed: but not, even in the remotest way, affecting the validity of the baptism already received. In all cases of private baptism—whether by a clergyman or layman, whether by a member of the Church, or by a dissenter,—the infant is presented in the faith and in the name of the whole Church of Christ, is bound in after life to perform the vows then silently made in its behalf, and receives remission of sin and regeneration and sanctification, by virtue of the Divine Promise, “He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.”

I cannot but remark here, that the doubt which is thus suggested from the Office of Confirmation, and “repetition of vows which were never pronounced,” is a proof of the danger of adding to and altering the offices and ritual of the Church. The ancient English ritual, from whence our present one in all its important details is derived, was in exact harmony throughout with the entire system and doctrine of the period. Take now, however, our Order of Confirmation. In the year 1662, a long addition was made to it, in the shape of a statement, (which had been in the former Common Prayer Books part of a rubric,) and of a question and answer based upon that statement: all very proper in itself, when properly explained and understood: but not necessary, nor proper, unless rightly understood, and unfortunately likely to lead to mistaken views of the great ordinance itself of confirmation. No one will think that I am overstating the consequence in this particular instance, who remembers how widely that error has been

spread amongst us, of regarding confirmation, merely as a confirming and renewal and repetition of vows by the candidates;—which it is only accidentally and by way of more edification;—and not, as a being confirmed, and strengthened, and made, in it and thereby, recipients of heavenly grace, and of the Holy Spirit;—which indeed and essentially it is.

“The admission of Roman Catholics, with some sort of religious service,” has, I am aware, occurred in more dioceses than one, of late years. Their peculiar case, if accurately examined, would probably open up many questions, on which I cannot enter: it is sufficient to remark, however, that in the diocese of —— (to which my correspondent referred) the persons admitted had not only been confirmed also, but were priests; and both their baptism and their ordination were justly recognized and allowed: neither the one nor the other suffering iteration. I have little doubt that it is in the power of the bishop of a diocese, to draw up, publish, and use a form for admission into the communion of the church of England: as he may for consecration and reconciliation of a church, for excommunication, degradation of clergy, and the like. But it would be very well if greater care were taken and more evidence displayed of some knowledge of the subject, than is commonly shewn in the compiling of such occasional Offices.

II. “What is your opinion in the case, not unusual, of a person who was never confirmed, but has been for some time a communicant? ought he to be confirmed or not?”

As confirmation cannot supply essential defects in an administration of the sacrament of baptism, so neither may the reception of the Holy Eucharist supply the want of confirmation. Each sacrament has especial blessings attached to it: nor can it convey other gifts than those of which it has been made by Divine appointment the channel and the means. The rubric at the end of the Order for Confirmation seems to prove this, as regards the point immediately before us: it does not, upon the one hand, make reception of the holy communion to depend upon having been previously confirmed, nor, upon the other hand, does it give the slightest hint, that confirmation can be omitted afterwards, if the



Eucharist has been received. It supposes a readiness and a desire to be confirmed still to exist.

III. The third case is that of a child, now about five years old, who is said to have been baptized, when not expected to live, shortly after his birth. There are some circumstances of peculiar negligence in this example: which—occurring as they did upon an occasion when, from the rank of the parties concerned, at least common care might have been looked for,—give an appearance of reason which is much to be lamented to the objections of carelessness often alleged against the clergy in their administration of baptism. The father of the boy, a nobleman, writes as follows: “The old clergyman of the parish came down to baptize my child. He was a very indifferent specimen of the old school, and his hand had become not quite steady. When he baptized the child I saw it, but not in a very good light, and not quite near it. It half struck me that I did not see the water touch the child; still I could by no means say that it did not. I said afterwards to the clergyman; ‘Did the water touch the child?’ He answered; ‘As much as usual.’ I said; ‘I do not feel sure that it has.’ To which he replied; ‘Well, perhaps it did not.’—He afterwards completed the office in the church, but he omitted the sentence ‘I certify you, *etc.*’”

I replied that, in my opinion, this was decidedly a case which demanded conditional baptism: the facts are important, that a doubt was expressed at the time, and that such miserable replies were given by the minister, proving his own indifference about the matter. Here there would be no desire or attempt to iterate the baptism, if it was indeed valid originally: but to supply it, if, as is highly probable, the first administration was null.

Some other difficulties, however, were suggested, against the propriety of hypothetical administration: these I removed. First, by shewing, that whatever the old clergyman’s general practice was, yet, that in *this* instance there is a doubt. The sole question is, its reasonableness. Either the child is, or is not, baptized: if baptized, administration *sub conditione* avoids all risk of iteration; if unbaptized, it supplies that, which



was absolutely not existing previously, a valid baptism.—Again: that if my correspondent, (the father, and the only observant witness) could positively assert that the water did not touch the child, it would no longer be a case for conditional, but for simple, administration: because such a fact would directly negative the validity of the previous ceremony. As it now stands, there is no certainty either way; in consequence of a doubt, felt and expressed at the time, and overruled (improperly) by the minister.—Again; that if the first administration was invalid, all that took place afterwards in church has no effect and must be utterly disregarded.—Again; that, although it is true, that the provision for conditional baptism occurs in one particular office, yet that it does not follow that that office is done and over. The provision occurs in the office of private baptism: and the question still is, “is this child baptized or unbaptized?” The person who has authority to determine this, is properly the parish-priest. The child is taken to church; in reply to the demand, “Has this child been already baptized?” the facts will be stated: viz. that a doubt exists as to whether the water touched the child, that that doubt was expressed at the time, and disregarded: disregarded, not because it was certainly unfounded, but because it appeared to the minister to involve no essential consequence. Then (for it is not to be supposed that a parish-priest would deliberately decide otherwise against such evidence of serious doubts) baptism would be given hypothetically, and the rest of the office, as appointed, would immediately follow.

IV. A case was referred to me of a person who had grown to the age of nearly twenty years, under the supposition that she had been, like the rest of her family, baptized. She had also been confirmed, and had received the Holy Eucharist. But, accident making it necessary, no evidence could be obtained of the fact of her baptism: the parish register duly contained the names of her brothers and sisters, but not her own: her father and mother had died; and no one living could give any evidence, either one way or the other, on the matter. I advised that baptism should be administered con-

ditionally; as to an adult: and, of course, confirmation also would be to be repeated.

V. Another case was the following:—"An adult, having been privately baptized in infancy, wishes to be *received into the Church*, i. e. to have the office completed. What office is to be used in such a case, nothing of the sort appearing to be contemplated in our ritual?"

This difficulty has been incidentally answered above, *p.* 381; but it may be well to repeat that the proper mode of receiving such a person into the visible membership and communion of the Church, is by administering confirmation; or, (if confirmation cannot be obtained) by admission to the reception of the Holy Eucharist, if a desire and fitness to receive confirmation exist. Confirmation, of course, to be sought for at the earliest possible opportunity which shall afterwards occur.

The Office in our present Book, which is appointed to follow (completing in a certain sense) the administration of private baptism, is not to be used in the case here suggested: and my correspondent was correct in supposing that such an use of it was not contemplated. It is however to be remembered that in the Roman ritual there is a special office, entitled; "*Ordo supplendi omnia super baptizatum.*" I would refer the reader to that order, and he will perceive that the object and purpose of it are different from the apparently like, but really unlike, office in the English ritual.

Taken in its obvious aspect this last only contemplates the admitting into the Church an infant or child baptized privately in time of necessity. In the case of one privately baptized in infancy demanding such admission after attaining years of maturity, I have not ventured to allow the use of an office framed for another purpose, and a different emergency. Whether it would not have been desirable to meet the difficulty by adding such an office to our ritual may remain a question, while it would seem to open a door to that dangerous license in ritual matters, which would alter the letter of existing forms, to suit what perhaps is their spirit. In the case under consideration the rite of public admission into the visible congregation is not an essential of the Sacra-

ment of baptism. With regard to adjuncts to the same sacrament two classes have been commonly distinguished : namely ; those which “ non solum significant sed efficiunt : ” and those which “ nihil efficiunt sed solum significant. ” Under which last may, in a wide way of speaking, be reckoned the rite (so to call it) of public admission into the Church. Of the former class, when included in the office of baptism, as anciently in the English rituals, the doctrine of the schools is, not that they confer the grace of baptism, but, that they render the soul fit to receive that grace. Exorcism is given as an example, by the omission of which the validity of baptism is untouched, but the grace of the sacrament is supposed to remain dormant : as if a seminal virtue had been by the administration of the sacrament implanted, which the subsequent reception of the omitted sacramental calls into activity. The conclusion therefore is, that though the proper place of such exorcism is before baptism, yet when omitted in the administration of baptism in time of necessity, it must be afterwards supplied : “ quia, sicut impeditur effectus baptismi, antequam percipiatur, ita potest impediri, postquam fuerit perceptus. ” Cf. *Aquinas. Summa. pars. III. qu. lxxi. art. 3.* If this rite of admission into the visible congregation were of that nature which the scholastic divines attribute to the rite of exorcism,—namely, that the omission of it hinders the grace of baptism from exhibiting its powers of fruitfulness,—the conclusion among ourselves would be, that, at whatever period of life, it ought to be performed, in order to render effective the baptism given in infancy, and in order (as it were) to set at liberty and to call forth the energies of baptismal grace, existing in a true but in a suspended life. But if, as is reasonable, we reckon our rite of admission, as analogous to those of the second class distinguished by the schools, which signify but do not confer,—and, as a specimen of which an example is instanced in the rite of putting on the white garment,—we may conclude that as its omission does not suspend the grace of the sacrament of baptism, it is right in the case of adults to admit into the Church by confirmation and communion, and not to alter and endeavour to

adapt our present ritual to a case which it did not contemplate.

VI. Some of the clergy advise conditional baptism to be given to persons who acknowledge that they have been baptized by a dissenting teacher, if they themselves,—that is, the persons who have been so baptized,—doubt the validity of lay-administration. This recommendation seems to me to proceed from what I believe and have elsewhere shewn to be a dangerous principle,—namely, the admission, in so grave a matter as a sacrament, of an authority residing in the subjective doubts, however pious, of an individual mind, rather than in formal ecclesiastical decisions and principles,—I may content myself with the single caution that a sound theology can settle the question, only in deference to the supremacy of scripture and catholic tradition: and that it must be always an inquiry, not about feelings, but about facts.

To the above statement of some doubts and difficulties which have been named to me, I would add a brief remark upon the review of my dissertation, in number lxi. of the *Christian Remembrancer*. Agreeing, as I do, with the general view taken in that article, I wish to point out a passage in which my own arguments seem to me to have been mistaken: and I am the more anxious to do this, on account of the influence which is justly attributed to the publication which I am now referring to. The reviewer says; “in case the child is alleged to have been baptized by a Wesleyan preacher, who is not the Rubric’s *any other lawful minister, etc.*” This is the exact point in dispute, between those who hold and those who deny that the church of England does still recognize the validity of lay-baptism: a question which I believe that I have decided in my dissertation in direct opposition to the assertion here made: at least, I have endeavoured to support my decision by argument, and not simply taken it for granted.

# Index.

- B**APTISM, necessary. 55. To be carefully performed. 68. One drop sufficient. 69. Should coincide with the enunciation of the Form. 136.
- Alexander, pope: his decision on the Form. 121.
- Ambrose, S.: on baptism "in the Name of Jesus." 155.
- Angels: especially present at baptism. 360. *note*.
- Anselm, S.: on "the baptism of John." 306. *note*.
- Apostolical Constitutions: antiquity. 95. 164. *note*.
- Apostles: when baptized. 301.
- Articles: the xxvijth. 17. 349. Not a definition of baptism. 18. 25.
- Baptism: meaning of the term. 1. First of the sacraments. 9. Definitions. 12. 27, 28. Difficulties proposed. 49. *note*. 122. *note*. 321. Our ministrations unjustly objected to. 69. 82. "In utero matris," invalid, 71. 216. To be by one minister only. 140. "In the Name of Jesus." 144. "In the Name of the Holy Ghost." 158. Private, without necessity, forbidden. 173. *note*. Administration of it, held by some to be peculiar, ordinarily, to the sacerdotal character. 180. 183. By women. 201, 202. 208. *note*. Not to be administered, except in necessity, by parents. 213. *note*. Of oneself, invalid. 214. *note*. *Valid*, not necessarily *sufficient*? 220. *note*. Prayer, not essential. 26. 241. *note*. Its necessity. 253. "Flaminis." 257. 266. Supplied by martyrdom. 270. When instituted. 279. 306. "Of John." 287. Of our B. Lord by S. John. 304. Has a double signification. 312. Various particulars not treated of in this dissertation. 316. Hypothetical. 317. [And Appendix.] Administered "*invitis parentibus*." 337. 343. 345. The blessings and effects. 349. Of the penitent thief. 368. *note*. A "seal." 374. *note*.
- Baptisteries: dedicated, with altars, *etc*. 8. *note*.
- Benediction: see Water.
- Bernard, S.: on baptism "in the name of Jesus." 162.
- Bethesda, the pool, a type. 11. *note*.
- Burials, "indecent," in the Scotch Kirk. 250. *note*.
- Calvin: his followers in England denied the validity of lay-baptism. 227. His heresy concerning baptism. 261. On "John's baptism." 289. His contempt for Scripture. 294.
- Canons: the 12th of 1575. 238. the 69th of 1604. 240.
- Cangiamila, his book. 216. *note*.
- Catechism: of Nowell. 25.
- Cathari: their heresy regarding the *matter*. 32.
- "Character:" in baptism. 357. 360. Defined by the schoolmen. 358.



- Children : anciently communicated in one kind only. 7. *note*. Dying unbaptized. 23. *note*. Baptized, anciently ordered to be separated from unbelieving parents. 343.
- Christ's Body and Blood received in baptism. 21.
- Christen : for "baptize." 135.
- Clinic baptism. 63. 65.
- Confirmation : confounded with baptism. 258.
- Conditions : "de futuro," invalidate baptism. 319. 322.
- Cranmer, archbishop : on baptism. 20.
- Deacons : commissioned to baptize. 177. 185. Anciently restrained. 179.
- Deaconesses. 203. *note*.
- Dead : baptism for the. 3.
- Effects of baptism. 349.
- Efficacy of baptism. 9. *note*. 10. 19.
- Equivalent Names : not permitted in the Form. 127.
- Essentials : and non-essentials. 100. *note*.
- Ethiopians : said to repeat baptism annually. 335. *note*.
- Eucharist : given to children, *etc*. 6. *note*. The *Matter*. 29. Not distinguished by the church of Rome. *ibid*. *note*. Only to be consecrated by a priest. 196. Its necessity. 256. Unlike baptism, may be reiterated. 334.
- Fire : baptism by. 33. *note*.
- Flagellants. 35.
- Font : necessity of it. 51. *note*. 90. *note*. Descent into it, anciently. 57. *note*. Benediction, see Water.
- Form : in baptism, essential. 98. 101. 169. Anciently. 99. What alterations allowable. 101. In the Greek Church. 102. 114. 120. The one appointed, reasonable. 104. Always used. 106. Should distinguish the agent, and the subject. 111. 115. Interpolations in some rituals. 124. Change of the Divine Names. 125. Use of it should accompany ablution. 136. How rendered invalid. 138. Must include explicit mention of the Trinity. 160. *note*. English clergy not sufficiently careful in inquiring into it. 170. In "the baptism of John." 290.
- Frith : on the effects of baptism. 371.
- Greek objections to the Latin Form. 113. *note*.
- Hemerobaptistæ. 335. *note*.
- Homilies. 24.
- Hooper, bishop : on the effects of baptism. 372.
- Hypothetical administration. 317. Not invented by the schoolmen. 323. 325. Why not often used in our Church. 326. Not to be hastily resorted to. 327. Why adopted by the Church. 327.
- Immersion : why discontinued. 61. *note*. Not necessary. 67. Not recommended now, in the English ritual. 68. *note*.
- Infants : dying unbaptized. 267. 373. Offered for baptism, by the Church. 347.
- Innocents : saved by martyrdom. 273. *note*.
- Institution of baptism. 279. Before the Resurrection. 284.
- Invocation : not always to be con-

- nected with benediction. 93.  
 99. *note*. Sometimes triple. 94.  
*note*.
- Iteration of baptism: forbidden.  
 324. 328. Why. 332.
- Jewell, bishop: 21. *note*. 22.  
 sometimes unfair. 223. *note*.
- John Baptist S.: his baptism. 3.  
 Distinct from the Christian sacrament. 287. 293. 296. The distinction explained away by the followers of Luther. 288. *note*. Doctrine of the Church of England. 294.
- Laurence, S.; 60. *note*.
- Lay-baptism. 189. Canons regarding it. 194. Acknowledged by the Church. 195. 200. In the church of England. 206. Canon-law. 207. English councils. 208. Canonists. 211. Two questions involved. 251. [See also, 388.]
- Lollards: their heresy. 260.
- Luther: on the *Matter* in baptism. 38.
- Manipulus curatorum. 9. *note*.
- Martyrdom: in the place of baptism. 270. Eminent beyond it. 275.
- Matter of the sacrament of baptism. 29. 47. Heretical notions. 31.
- Midwives: anciently licensed. 203. *note*. 227.
- Naaman: a type. 11. *note*.
- Names of baptism: significative. 4.
- Names not to be given to children improperly. 174. *note*.
- "Name of Jesus," whether valid as a Form. 144. Interpretation of texts relating to it. 156.
- Necessity of baptism. 253. 263.
- As compared with the Eucharist. 256. Not until its promulgation. 314.
- Novatian: his baptism. 62. His baptisms admitted. 166. *note*. 168.
- Orders: not given to recipients of clinic baptism. 66.
- Orsi, cardinal: on baptism "In the Name of Jesus." 161. *note*.
- Parents: except in urgent necessity, not to administer baptism. 213. *note*.
- Paulianists. 110.
- Peckham, archbishop. 41. *note*.
- Penance: "do penance," for "repent." 20. *note*.
- Piscis: title of. 5. *note*.
- Piscina. 5. *note*. Attached to fonts. 8. *note*.
- Postills of 1550. 295. *note*. 375. *note*.
- Prayer: not essential in baptism. 26. 241. *note*.
- Pregnancy; no obstacle to reception of baptism. 73. *note*.
- Private baptism, except in necessity, forbidden. 173. *note*.
- Pupilla oculi. 15. *note*.
- Rebaptizations: by clergy of the church of Rome, in England. 69. 82. 321.
- "*Reformatio legum*:" not authoritative. 26.
- Regeneration: not to be explained in its mode of operation. 353. In baptism, always held by the Church. 354. 372. Denied by heretics, before the 16th century. 362.
- Sacrament: applied to baptism by Tertullian. 42. *note*.
- Sacramentals. 85. *note*.
- Sand: used in baptism. 36.

- Scotch kirk: not recognized by the church of England. 249. *note.*
- Scott, Rev. W. on lay-baptism. 197.
- "Signs" of baptism in exposed infants. 319.
- Siloam, the pool: a type. 11. *note.*
- Steps to the font: symbolical. 51. *note.*
- Stephen, S., pope: his acts. 118. *note.*
- "Subject" of baptism. 336.
- Taylor, bishop: on lay-baptism. 198. *note.*
- Thief: the penitent. 368. *note.*
- Tyndal: on the effects of baptism. 369.
- Trine immersion. 58. 74. Not necessary. 59. 78. Why, and when relaxed. 74. Continued in England. 77.
- Types of baptism. 10.
- Viaticum: baptism so called. 6. *note.*
- Waldenses: their heresy regarding the *Matter* in baptism. 35. Dr. Maitland's book. 36. *note.*
- Water: to be pure for baptizing. 50. Why chosen as the *Matter*. 51. Benediction of. 81. Not essential. 84, 85. In our ritual. 86. Disliked by the puritans. 87. *note.* Among English customs. 88. *note.* Sanctified by our Lord in Jordan. 282.
- Whitgift, archbishop: on lay-baptism. 224.
- Wickliffe: on the necessity of baptism. 259. On the effects of baptism. 366.
- Zachary, pope: his decision on the Form. 140. *note.*





THE MASTER'S COLLEGE



3 3540 00028 0764